Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-100
Tuesday
24 May 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-100 CONTENTS *24 May 1988*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Further Reportage on INF Treaty Ratification 1
Shultz Comments *[PRAVDA 24 May]* 1
Ligachev, Others Cited 1
Commissions Discuss INF 2
Central Europe Arms Talks Continue in Vienna 4

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Bloc Parties' Reform Efforts Described *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 5
CEMA Executive Committee Session Ends 8
Communique Issued *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 8

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

USSR-U.S. Human Rights Talks Held in Paris *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 10
U.S. Stand at UN Human Rights Debate Scored 10
Kiev Human Rights Seminar Issues Message 10
Petrovskiy on Role of Multilateral Diplomacy *[IZVESTIYA 21 May]* 11
Romania's Manescu Addresses Interaction Council *[Bucharest AGERPRES]* 11
IAEA's Blix Visits Kazakhstan Nuclear Reactor 12
IAEA-CEMA Nuclear Power Safety Meeting Opens 12
Further on Chernobyl Nuclear Conference in Kiev 12
Results Summed Up *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 14 May]* 12
Medical Aspects Discussed *[Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU 12 May]* 14
Gorbachev Greets International Music Festival 14
Maslennikov Reviews INF Treaty, Afghanistan *[PRAVDA 22 May]* 14

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Soviet-U.S. Moscow Summit 17
Shultz Comments 17
Human Rights 'First' on Agenda 17
Poll Shows 'Keen Interest' 17
Journalists Arrive 18
Press Center for Upcoming Moscow Summit Opens 18
Economist Abalkan Speaks 18
Burlatskiy Speaks 19
'First' News Conference 19
'Top Priority' Views 'Presummit Fever' 20
U.S. To Receive Summit Television Progam *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 21 May]* 24
Further Moscow Presummit Comments, Reports 24
CNN Interviews Howard Baker 24
Fitzwater on Preparations 24
Zholkver on U.S. Attitude 25
U.S. Senate Resumes Debate on INF Treaty 25
Rowny Criticizes U.S. Senate on INF Treaty 26
U.S. Preparing To Deploy Trident-2 26
Demichev Meets With U.S. Leadership Group 26
Soviet-U.S. Youth Seminar Opens in Tbilisi 26

China

Zhao Meets Czechoslovakia's Jakes in Beijing 27
Alekseyev Views Afghanistan Pullout, Relations 27

Northeast Asia

PRAVDA Reports End of Biryukova DPRK Visit *[23 May]* 28
All-Japan Seamen's Union Officials Interviewed 28

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Receives Vietnam's Nguyen Co Thach *[PRAVDA 24 May]* 29
Vietnamese Statement on Islands Dispute Noted 29
Deputy Premier Tolstykh Sees Off Thailand's Prem *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 30
New Zealand Parliamentarians Continue Tour 30
Visit Georgia 30
Arrive in Leningrad 30
Message Sent to Western Samoan Prime Minister *[IZVESTIYA 21 May]* 30

Near East & South Asia

No Civilians Killed in Kabul Rocket Attack 31
'Extremists' Shell Villages 31
Further on Attacks 31
Najibullah Interviewed on Future Government 31
TV Shows Troops' Complete Nangarhar Pullout 31
Bovin Describes 'Bitter Joy' on Troops' Return 32
Costs, Benefits of Afghan Presence Weighed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 May]* 33
Vavilov on 'Violation' of Geneva Accords 34
Pakistan Urged To Prohibit Arms Traffic 35
Noorani Announces Joint Commission Plans 35
Hashemi-Rafsanjani on 'State of War' With U.S. *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 36
Ryzhkov Condemns Chemical Weapon Use *[Tehran IRNA]* 36
Further 'Abd Al-Majid Activities in Moscow 36
Receives Message for Mubarak *[Cairo MENA]* 36
Holds News Conference *[Cairo MENA]* 36
Further on Comments *[Cairo AL-AKHBAR 22 May]* 37
Signs Protocol *[Cairo MENA]* 37
Departs Moscow 38
Vedernikov at Departure *[Cairo MENA]* 38
'Abd al-Majid on Visit 38
Talks Herald 'New Stage' *[Cairo MENA]* 39
India Struggles With Sikh 'Terrorism' *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 39

Sub-Saharan Africa

Four-Way Talks on Angola Welcomed *[Ponomarev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 May]* 40
Afghan 'Model' for Angola, Mozambique Considered 42
CPSU's Urnov Received by Zimbabwean Official *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* 42
Sao Tome Minister Thanks USSR for Aid *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 42

East Europe

Grosz Explains Future MSZMP Policy 43
Polish Spokesman on Summit, Gorbachev Visit 43
Poland's Malinowski Marks Peasant Day 22 May 43
LCY Prepares for Party Conference Objectives 44
Romanian Friendship Group Celebrates Anniversary *[Bucharest AGERPRES]* 44
Voronin Meets With Bulgaria's Lukanov *[PRAVDA 19 May]* 44

West Europe

UK Nuclear Arms Modernization Plan Criticized 45
Thatcher Doubles UK 'Secret Service' Funds 45
Thatcher Reception of Artistes 'Unprecedented' *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 21 May]* 45
FRG Spokesman on Expectations for Moscow Summit 45
FRG Ambassador on 'Fruitful Cooperation' 46
Official Notes Portuguese Expertise on S. Africa *[Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS 18 May]* 46
U.S. Maneuvers in Belgium Reported 46
Party Alignments Ahead of French Poll Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 21 May]* 47
Spaniards Protest U.S. Bases, NATO 47

Latin America & Caribbean

Kamentsev Continues Cooperation Talks in Cuba 48
Documents Signed 48
Session Ends 48
Chilean Communist Party's April Declaration 49

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

CPSU Central Committee Plenum Promotes Karpov 51
Decision Announced 51
Ligachev Addresses Plenum 51
Supreme Soviet Session Opens 24 May 52
Presidium Approves Agenda 52
Leaders Attending Listed 52
Voss, Ligachev Speak 52
Ryzhkov Presents Cooperatives Bill 53
Yakovlev, Dolgikh Armenia Activities Reported *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 54
Lithuanian Central Committee Plenum Held 5 May *[Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA 6 May]* .. 54
Zaslavskaya Calls for 'People's Front' *[Budapest]* 55
Cinematographers Criticize Irkutsk Official 55
Orthodox Church Leaders on Restructuring 55
Nomination of Conference Delegates 'Rushed' *[IZVESTIYA 21 May]* 56
KOMMUNIST Chief Editor on Party Conference *[London MORNING STAR 19 May]* 57
Bovin Stresses Role of Press Criticism *[MOSCOW NEWS No 19]* 58
Media Official Interviewed on Censorship 59
Podrabinek, Grigoryants on Unofficial Press *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 18 May]* 60
Policy on 'Unofficial Associations' Reviewed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 19]* 62
Leningrad, Moscow 'Informal' Groups Compared *[Rome AVANTI! 15-16 May]* 63
Journalist Calls for Glasnost in Drafting Laws *[PRAVDA 18 May]* 68
Review of Komsomol Apparatus Structure Proposed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 May]* 71
Stalin's Record as Strategist Criticized *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 15 May]* 76
Gorbachev Speeches, Articles Published 79

Economic

Supreme Soviet Cooperatives Debate Reported *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 79
Vasilenko on Debate 80
Republics Report Plan Fulfillment Statistics 81
Abalkin on Economic Model's Applicability *[Bratislava PRAVDA 17 May]* 81
Wage Delays 'Discredit' Restructuring *[TRUD 19 May]* 82
Excessive Raw Materials Extraction Cited *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 13 May]* 84

Agricultural

'Rural Hour' Debates Cooperatives Law 86

Scientific

Three 'Cosmos' Satellites Launched 21 May 87
Activities of 'Mir' Cosmonauts Reported 87
Research Work Continues 87
Soviet, Bulgarian Cosmonauts Hold Briefing 88
Nuclear Icebreaker 'Arktika' Leaves Murmansk *[PRAVDA 18 May]* 88
Briefs 88
Arctic Maps Compliled 88

Military

Political Directorate Views CPSU Admissions *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 May]* 88

Further Reportage on INF Treaty Ratification

Shultz Comments

PM2405103388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "G. Shultz' Opinion"]

[Text] Washington, 23 May—U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz has expressed the hope that the U.S. Senate will ratify the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles by the time that the Soviet-U.S. summit begins.

The process of examining the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has been very thorough, around 70 hearings have been held, and replies have been given to over 1,300 questions, Shultz stated during an ABC television program on Sunday. There is a time for hearings, a time for questions and criticism, and a time for debates, but the time has now come for decision-making. I believe that we are close to that point.

Replying to a question on the possibility of the conclusion of a USSR-U.S. agreement on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive armaments before the end of the current administration's term of office, Shultz stressed that in his opinion this is a possibility. However, he noted, quite a few complex problems still have to be resolved. At the same time the Secretary of State pointed out that the administration's position on SDI remains the same.

Ligachev, Others Cited

LD2305190088 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The Soviet parliament's foreign relations commissions met in the Kremlin today to continue their deliberations on the INF Treaty signed by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Washington last December.

Yegor Ligachev, who chairs the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union, one of the two houses in the Soviet parliament—the Supreme Soviet, first briefed the MP's on the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee plenum earlier in the day.

Ligachev, who is a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the party's Central Committee, said there was every reason to say that "the plenum worked out the party's platform for the upcoming national conference".

"These theses make a thorough analysis of the experience of the party's three years of work following the April (1985) Central Committee plenum and put forward a whole number of important proposals concerning the realization of the policy of perestroyka (restructuring) and renewal in our society, economic reform, broader democratization and glasnost (openness), and efforts to foster a healthy moral-political atmosphere.

"In short, important decisions were made," Ligachev said.

He noted that as the foreign policy aspects of the party's activities had been examined, a review had been made of everything it had been doing to forge a system of comprehensive security and stronger world peace.

"And we are now to continue discussing one of the more important problems—the issue of ratifying the Soviet-American INF Treaty," Ligachev said.

The chairman of an expert group formed by the two foreign affairs commissions to scrutinize the treaty, Georgiy Korniyenko, then commented on the group's report on the subject, which took into account the points of view of the socialist countries directly affected by the INF Treaty—the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia—and the opinion of the foreign public.

"The main gauge when judging the treaty was its strict compliance with the principle of equal security for the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries, on the one hand, and for the United states and its NATO allies, on the other," Korniyenko said.

"Since part of the Soviet people have expressed anxiety over the fact that the Soviet side under the treaty is to destroy more intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles than the United States and has agreed to disregard in this case British and French missiles, these matters were studied particularly carefully.

"The expert group's conclusion is unequivocal: There are no objective grounds for such anxieties, the defense capability of the USSR and its allies remains reliably ensured," Korniyenko continued.

He described the treaty as a drastically new step in efforts to fend off the threat of nuclear war and said its realization would mean that "two links will be torn out of the nuclear chain fettering Earth and this chain will be broken."

"This will create conditions for continuing to wring more and more links from it until its complete elimination," Korniyenko added.

Proceeding from all that, the expert group, he said, recommended the foreign affairs commissions to advise the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to ratify the INF Treaty.

Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee who chairs the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, said the treaty for destroying two classes of nuclear missiles was a first real step towards a nuclear-free world.

"The special responsibility shown by the commissions' members in examining the treaty was determined by their awareness that this document is of fundamental, history-making significance," he said.

"Judging by incoming data, the U.S. Senate in the next few days," he noted, "will complete deliberations on the treaty with a positive descision as well, despite some current difficulties."

"One would like to hope that following the ratification of the INF Treaty, the United States will demonstrate readiness to continue going further along the path of disarmament when the world in a few days' time witnesses another Soviet-U.S. summit, this time in Moscow, and also after that meeting," Dobrynin added.

The commissions recommended the Supreme Soviet Presidium to ratify the INF Treaty.

Commissions Discuss INF

LD2305224088 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1850 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 May (TASS)—The foreign affairs commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet met in the Kremlin today to continue consideration of the treaty on the liquidation of Soviet and U.S. intermediate- and shoter-range missiles, which was signed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan last December.

Taking part in the joint session were: Ye. K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Council of the Union; A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Council of Nationalities; and A.E. Voss, chairman of the Council of Nationalities. Also present in the hall were deputies of other commissions of both chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, representatives of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the USSR Ministry of Defense, the USSR Committee for State Security, other interested departments and many public organizations, as well as heads and representatives of diplomatic missions accredited to Moscow and Soviet and foreign correspondents.

Ye. K. Ligachev chaired the session. He informed those assembled about yesterday's CPSU Central Committee Plenum. All the grounds are present for saying that the plenum worked out a platform with which the party is going to its all-union conference, the speaker stressed. The theses thoroughly analyze the 3-year experience of the party's work following the April Central Committee plenum, and put forward a series of important proposals connected with implementing the policy of restructuring, the renewal of our society, carrying out economic reform, the development of democratization, glasnost, and establishing a healthy sociopolitical atmosphere. In short, important decisions were adopted.

During examination of the foreign policy aspects of the party's activity, appraisal was made of everything which is now being done to create a system of all-embracing security and to strengthen peace throughout the world. Today we are indeed required to continue the discussion of one of the most important problems, the question of the ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty.

Ye. K. Ligachev went on to recall that a working organ of the Foreign Affairs Commission was formed in February of this year—a Preparatory Commission, which for nearly 3 months worked in detail on formulating the text of the treaty.

The floor was given to G.M. Korniyenko, chairman of the Preparatory Commission, who commented on its report. It notes that during the work of the Preparatory Commission a total of more than 30 experts, representatives of government institutions and public organizations, were heard, and a large number of letters and appeals from citizens studied.

The report took into account the views of representatives of the socialist countries who are directly concerned by the treaty: the GDR and the CSSR, and also of the foreign public.

The main guideline in evaluating the treaty was the document's strict accordance with the principle of even and equal security for the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries on the one hand, and the United States and its NATO allies on the other.

In connection with the concern expressed by some Soviet people that the Soviet side, according to the treaty, has to eliminate a greater number of intermediate- and short-range missiles than the United States, and that it agreed at the same time not to take into account the British and French missiles, these questions were studied particularly carefully. The conclusion of the Preparatory Commission was unambiguous: There are no grounds for such concern; the defense capability of the USSR and its allies will remain reliably guaranteed.

The work of the Preparatory Commission also confirmed that a reliable system of verifying [kontrol] its fulfillent is included in the treaty.

The relevant USSR ministries and departments are ready to fulfill the treaty at the appropriate time, and after the ratification of the treaty of intermediate- and short-range missiles, will monitor carefully to ensure that the other side observes the obligations it has taken upon itself just as punctiliously.

In the course of the postwar period the Supreme Soviet has had occasion to examine many important international treaties, G.M. Korniyenko stressed. Without in any way detracting from their importance, he remarked, one can say with all certainty that the INF Treaty we are discussing today is a qualititively new stage in the struggle to remove the nuclear threat. Its implementation will mean that two links have been knocked out of the nuclear chain surrounding the earth. The chain will be broken, and this will create the conditions to tear more and more links from it, right up to the time it is destroyed.

On this basis, the Preparatory Commission recommends in its report that the foreign affairs commissions of both chambers give a positive conclusion to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium with regard to the ratification of the INF Treaty.

Z.P. Pukhova, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women, and S.N. Chelnokov, chairman of the Committee of Youth Organizations expressed the support of Soviet women, youth, and all Soviet society for the historic INF Treaty. It is essential to do everything possible to see that further steps follow, leading to disarmament, and in the final resort to the elimination of nuclear danger, they said.

Deputies P.M. Telepnev, P.A. Zagrebelnyy, N.I. Bagina, and A.K. Zitmanis spoke in favor of ratifying the Soviet-U.S. treaty. The great significance of the work on all aspects of the treaty, including the socioeconomic and the ecological, which had been conducted by the Preparatory Commission, was noted. It is important, the speakers stressed, not to allow "a pause" following the signing and the ratification. Unfortunately, certain representatives of the NATO countries seek precisely that by raising the issue of "compensations," that is, stepping up conventional armaments, and modernizing tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

Summing up the results of the discussion, A.F. Dobrynin noted that the path to the Washington meeting and the INF Treaty had not been simple and easy. Following the Soviet-U.S. Geneva summit in November 1985, where the Soviet and U.S. leaders declared to the world that a nuclear war could not be won, and that it should never be unleashed, the Soviet Union offered a radical way to exclude the very possibility of the outbreak of such a war—a program of complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this century.

Reykjavik was, of course, another milestone of decisive importance in terms of winning wide international recognition for the idea of a non-nuclear world. It was precisely then that many people in the world believed, perhaps for the first time, in the possibility of reversing the slide toward a nuclear catastrophe and of ridding our planet of all nuclear weapons.

To ensure that this faith did not fade away, but, on the contrary, could strengthen and become a driving force, it was very important to make first practical steps toward a non-nuclear world. The treaty eliminating the two classes of nuclear missiles has become such a first real step.

The awareness of the fact that we were dealing with a document of such crucial, historic significance made the commissions' members approach the examination of the given treaty with special responsibility. A good deal of work has been done to analyze comprehensively and in a detailed way both the text of the trety and its relevant documents, and the consequences which their implementation would entail in the foreign policy, military, financial, economic, ecological, and other spheres.

It ought to be stated bluntly, the speaker went on to say, that the process of examining at the USSR Supreme Soviet the issue of ratifying an international treaty signed by the Soviet Union was this time essentially different from the practice that existed in the past. Along with the significance of the document under examination, there is also another explanation to it: Democratization of the life of Soviet society, which is taking place at present, naturally, cannot but affect the activities of the soviets at all levels.

Appraising the work conducted by the commissions, the speaker stressed that it has made it possible to be convinced of the strict correspondence of the treaty with the security interests of the Soviet Union and its allies, and of the reliability of methods of verification [kontrolya] laid down in the text of the treaty. We, he said, did not let escape from view for even a minute that our approach to the treaty is determined by the integral foreign policy concept being implemented by the party and the Soviet State in the spirit of new thinking, a concept built on the consistent search for a balance of interests of the partners in intergovernmental relations.

To judge from incoming data, A.F. Dobrynin said, the U.S. Senate, in the near future, despite certian difficulties, will also complete the review of the treaty with the adoption of a positive decision. We will hope that the ratification of the treaty in both countries will also be met with satisfaction by Americans, who, with an overwhelming majority, just as ardently as our people, welcomed the signing of this historic document. Other peoples also await the ratification of the treaty, hoping that its going into force and implementation will give a mighty impetus to further movement along the road to disarmament.

Of course, we must not discount those forces which would like to put a brake on the process of transfer to a nuclear-free world, which has begun. In the West there are still quite a few figures who are not giving up a stake on the dangerous doctrine of "nuclear deterrence," intentions to gain military superiority.

However, common sense, a realistic and responsible approach, should gain the upper hand over politial short-sightedness. One would like to hope that following the ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles the United States will show readiness to move further forward on the road to disarmament, when in a few days time the world will become witness to a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, on this occasion in Moscow, and also after the Moscow meeting.

Ye.K. Ligachev put forward for voting the draft of conclusion on the question of the ratification of the treaty. On the basis of all-around thorough consideration of the treaty, it says in particular in the document that the foreign affairs commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet have come to the conviction that the clauses of the treaty and the documents relating to it, in their totality, meet the security interests of the Soviet Union and its allies, as they do the broader interests of lessening the danger of war and of consolidating peace.

The commissions recommended to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium that it ratify the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the liquidation of their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

We can feel satisfied with today's discussion, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Council of the Union said in conclusion. All the speeches testify to our unanimity. The act with which the meeting of the commissions ended really and truly has reflected the mood of our society, the love of peace of our people. The view of the Soviet people is one—to strenghten peace, the security of our country, and international security. The speaker said that in the future the deputies will have to focus on verification of the observance of the clauses of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

Central Europe Arms Talks Continue in Vienna

LD1905175488 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 19 May 88

[Text] Vienna May 19 TASS—Another round of talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe opened in Vienna's Hofburg Palace today.

The first full-scale session was addressed by Valerian Mikhaylov, leader of the Soviet delegation, on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty members and by Michael Sheston, leader of the Canadian delegation, on behalf of the NATO members.

Bloc Parties' Reform Efforts Described
PM2405092188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Conversations and interviews from Prague, Budapest, Sofia, and Hanoi prepared by own correspondents S. Vtorushin, V. Gerasimov, L. Zhmyrev, and M. Domogatskikh: "How Our Friends Are Restructuring: Four Questions on Internal Party Democracy"—first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Restructuring, that expansive concept used to characterize the present stage of Soviet society and multilevel work in implementing the 27th CPSU Congress decisions, is becoming increasingly internationalized. Life in many other socialist countries is now also imbued with an atmosphere of radical renewal.

Each fraternal country is conducting a creative search based on a consideration of its own historical experience, conditions, and national traditions. At the same time, it is clear that that search is taking a similar general direction aimed at eliminating bureaucracy, at the moral cleansing of society, and at defending the principles of social justice and of socialism. The ruling Marxist-Leninist parties, as the working people's militant vanguard which set the example in everything, are the primary links in the renewal and the deepening of democratization. Like the CPSU they are striving to distinguish between the functions of party and state organs and are increasingly actively supporting a course of developing glasnost. They have begun paying particularly great attention recently to improving the electoral system. This collective search enriches Marxist-Leninist teaching on enhancing the party's leading role in socialist society.

Today, PRAVDA'S correspondents describe a number of experiments and decisions by communists in the fraternal countries in the democratization of internal party life. In our view they are of some interest.

Prague: How Often Should the Secretary Be Replaced? [subhead]

The CPCZ Central Committee April (1988) Plenum, which examined questions of party work in conditions of restructuring, took a number of important decisions. They include the limitation of tenure of an elected post. This decision applies to all party workers from the leader of a primary party organization to the general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

"Why was this decision taken?" we asked Karel Urbanek, chief of the CPCZ Central Committee Political Organization Department.

"Before answering that question," he observed, "I should like to say a few words about the preparation of the April plenum. Not only the CPCZ leadership but all communists understood that the plenum had to answer many important questions of concern to the party and society.

"During the preparation for the plenum, Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, visited a number of labor collectives. At meetings with working people and party workers there was a frank discussion of the problems facing our society and ways of resolving them. At the same time Karel Hoffmann, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, went to all the party kraj committees where he sought people's opinions on those same questions and talked with members of party kraj committees, party veterans, and members and candidate members of the CPCZ Central Committee. RUDE PRAVO conducted a survey on this theme before the plenum.

"The cadre problem was one of the many questions discussed by those who took part in the meetings and in the survey. The vast majority of communists supported the limitation of tenure of elected office."

[Question] Why was that?

[Answer] People are only human. A leader who has been in one place a long time begins to get used to many things, including shortcomings. He ceases to notice so-called minor problems, which are in fact very important ones, particularly if they affect a large number of people. A leader becomes accustomed to those around him; he becomes tolerant of those who become less exacting toward themselves. This alone harms the cause. There is another side to the question. After a certain time everyone becomes accustomed to certain methods of leadership which he sometimes cannot relinquish, even if the circumstances demand it.

Of course, I cannot say that this is true of all party workers. We have quite a few people who give their all to their work day after day. But the exception does not make the rule. The Central Committee April plenum took the decision that the leader of a party organization, from the primary organization to the kraj organization, cannot hold that post for more than three consecutive terms. The decision made no mention of the other secretaries and bureau members. But it goes without saying that the new rule applies to them, too.

On the basis of the April plenum decisions the next CPCZ congress will make the appropriate addition to the party rules. However, this does not mean that we have decided to wait for the congress. Even during the preparation for the district report and election conferences held right after the plenum a number of first secretaries were replaced. This affected 31 people out of 126 in district party organizations. New first secretaries were

elected in the Prague and Bratislava city party committees as well as in three kraj committees. Whereas in 1986 we had 10 first secretaries of party kraj committees who had been in their post for over 10 years, now that figure has been halved.

The plenum decisions affected not only party workers. It was said there that a similar limited tenure should be applied in state, economic, and other organizations.

[Question] What will happen to someone who has served as leader of a party organization for the allotted term.

[Answer] If he is an able man he may be elected to the same post in a different district or region. Or he may be promoted within the apparatus of a superior party organ. From the district committee to the kraj committee, for example, or the party Central Committee: Able people are needed everywhere. But in any event, at the end of his term of office a party worker's activity will be assessed. I believe that this will promote wholehearted working, will increase the activity of our party cadres, and consequently will lead to the acceleration of restructuring.

Of course, all this places a special responsibility on work with cadres. That is particularly true of our department. We need to know people, their abilities, and their term of office in an elected post very well and must strictly ensure that party committees carry out cadre transfers on time.

[Question] And, of course, the final question. This applies to the general secretary, too....

[Answer] The April plenum also made a decision with regard to the general secretary of our party Central Committee. The tenure of this post is limited to two terms, that is, 10 years. A similar term of office is laid down for the post of first recretary of the Slovak Communist Party Central Committee. I must point out that this suggestion was made by Milos Jakes himself. The post of general secretary is extraordinarily complex and responsible, it takes all a man's strength.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the preparation for the CPCZ Central Committee April Plenum was carried out on the basis of broad internal party democracy. The main task which the plenum raised is to substantially increase the activity of each party member. There is something here for the leadership of kraj and district committees to ponder. Does the style of their work not promote passivity among communists? It is they who must develop broad internal party democracy and increase communists' activeness. That will be the basis for the development of democracy throughout society. The party must set an example here. It began restructuring, it is guiding it, and it will see it through. But to achieve that it is necessary to analyze the style and methods of work, to discard anything that is superfluous or has not lived up to expectations, and to adopt only what leads the party and all the people forward. Limiting tenure of an elected post is one such step.

Budapest: How Many Candidates? [subhead]

The post of secretary for economic questions fell vacant at the MSZMP megye committee in Fejer Megye (whose center is Szekesfehervar). On the basis of the new principles of elections within the party a commission was set up to shortlist candidates. It offered the megye committee bureau members two candidates. Both were communists— people well known in the region. One is leader of a local enterprise, the other first secretary of the Szekesfehervar MSZMP City Committee. The nominations were discussed, then a secret ballot took place. The majority, it turned out, preferred the enterprise leader (who was 10 years younger than his rival, incidentally). The city committee first secretary stayed in his old post.

In the mid-eighties as an experiment the communists in some MSZMP party organizations conducted direct and secret separate elections at meetings for the post of secretary and the posts of members of the party bureau and party committees. The practice of so-called multicandidate elections became widespread: In such elections two or more candidates are nominated for one post. The improvement of the party electoral system has been discussed at a number of Central Committee plenums since the 13th MSZMP Congress (held in 1985).

"In the past 3 years eight megye and city committee first secretaries have been elected under the multicandidate system," Zsuzsa Farkasinszky, deputy chief of the MSZMP Central Committee Party and Mass Organizations Department, told your PRAVDA correspondent in conversation. "In primary organizations this practice is becoming increasingly decisive in the development of party democracy."

Nowadays a commission for nominations to the new party leadership is elected at the party meeting preceding the report and election meeting. Commission members talk with communists and sound out their opinions and suggestions. In that way the list of nominations for secret ballots and elections of secretaries is drawn up.

"The biggest problem is how to employ those communists who 'failed'—who did not poll sufficient votes," Z. Farkasinszky said. "This element of the multicandidate electoral system needs amplification and further work. Incidentally, the MSZMP Central Committee decision that certain party posts may be held by the same person for no more than two terms is also difficult to put into practice for that reason. There are still some questions to be resolved: How to improve the promotion of people and how to rotate leading party cadres more rationally."

The new electoral practice will also be examined at the national party conference which opens 20 May. Its draft resolution, which has been widely discussed by communists, points out in particular that the new internal party electoral system must be introduced during the preparation for the next party congress, the 14th congress.

Sofia: Why Has the Apparatus Been Streamlined? [subhead]

"The party must not be just a tier in the management hierarchy—we are trying to use that important conclusion from the national party conference in Sofia last January in our everyday work," Filyu Chakurov, first secretary of Shumen BCP municipal committee, noted during our conversation.

Under the new administrative and territorial division of Bulgaria the old Shumen Okrug has been merged with Varna Oblast. The apparatus of the former Shumen BCP Okrug Committee has been abolished. The new Shumen municipal party organization unites 320 primary organizations—in all, 12,000 communists. We should note that 117,000 people on the municipality's territory.

The party municipal committee apparatus consists of a first secretary and three deputies, who head three commissions respectively—ideological, organizational, and the party leadership of the economy. The commission members work on social principles. The three abolished departments have been replaced by two groups—party organizers (10 people) and an information service (8 people). A further three staffers belong to the cadres and accounting sector. That is the whole staff.

"We are seeking to make the municipal party organization the strike force of restructuring," my interlocutor continued. "Our principle now is not to command but to counsel, relying on the aktiv and carefully studying public opinion. To operate by means of persuasion. And to build relations with the people's council and with judicial and monitoring organs in the new way—not by supplanting them or assuming their functions."

...It should be noted that during the restructuring of party organs' work this was a key question from the very outset. For example, in an article in the BCP Central Committee's theoretical journal NOVO VREME, the duplication by party organs of the functions of the state and economic management functions was regarded as a serious deformation in the practical implementation of the party's leading role. "The fallacious assumption of party organs' 'omnipotence,'" Momchil Todorov, author of the article, believes, "also had an adverse effect on internal party life, tending to transform party organs into centers of administration, intensifying bureaucracy and formalism in party activity, and restricting democracy within the party. The greatly inflated and bureaucratized party apparatus is the direct manifestation of those deformations." At the same time NOVO VREME points to the need to unswervingly observe the principle of the party's leading role.

As the meetings in Shumen showed, efforts to eliminate the deformations that have occurred are being taken at all levels, including primary party organizations. Take, for example, the "Madara" truck combine. There are 820 communists there. The combine committee is headed by Yordan Borisov, an experienced leader. Through him the municipal committee constantly has its finger on the "pulse" of all the combine's 19 primary party organizations. Since the enterprise's transfer to the principles of self-management and economic accountability the emphasis has been placed on increasing the party's influence among teams. What does this mean? Under the new conditions of labor organization and remuneration, your PRAVDA correspondent was told at Madara, you do not achieve much by using the old "reprimands." The most important thing now is the painstaking selection, evaluation, placement, and training of cadres and increasing exactingness toward BCP members. In this the prime ally and helper of the plant's communists is the municipal committee party organizer. It is no longer the functionary or the "apparatchik," the plant's party members observed in conversation, but the active champion of innovation who in each instance has a permanent link with the primary party organizations. This does not mean a telephone link or an office link, but constant visits to shops, institutes, agrarian-industrial complexes, and involvement in labor collectives' varied lives.

"In all this work," F. Chakurov said in conclusion, "we are inspired by the example of the USSR's communists, who are approaching their 19th all-union party conference. Our actions have much in common, although of course we each have our own characteristics. We Bulgarian communists are greatly impressed by the determination of the CPSU's leadership to continue the cause of restructuring and see it through to the end. We can see that Soviet restructuring is already being embodied in concrete deeds."

...The restructuring of the BCP party apparatus, as practice shows, is a difficult process. Concern has been expressed here more than once that it is taking too long to streamline and cut the cost of that process. But as the recent national party conference showed, the BCP intends to continue this course consistently and steadfastly.

Hanoi: What Does Glasnost Hold in Store? [subhead]

An article in NHAN DAN dedicated to the unseemly actions of an economic leader in Hai Hung Province aroused mixed reactions among the country's party organizations. Some saw it as a good example of criticism independent of official position or past services, in

other words, that very example of the renewal of thinking which the party is urging. Other people, who have still not realized that the party has begun not a short-term campaign but a strategic offensive to rectify the negative phenomena and to reorganize society's spiritual and material life, gave the article a hostile reception.

A particularly uncompromising stance was adopted by the leader of a provincial party committee and member of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee, who viewed the newspaper article as an act "unprecedented" in the Vietnamese press and as a proclamation of something which should not have been publicized. The Central Committee, however, condemned this attitude and urged that glasnost be developed more widely in the party, because without it progress is inconceivable. An investigation revealed serious crimes by the Hai Hung economic leader and the court punished him as severely as the law allows. The party provincial committee secretary also had to leave his post.

"We believe that in its way this newspaper article was a signal for the renewal of cadre policy which the party has begun," Le Huynh Thong, a leading Vietnamese party journalist, told your PRAVDA correspondent. "On the eve of, and particularly since, the sixth party congress, the CPV has begun purging the party and state apparatus of people who had come into conflict with the party rules and the laws of the state. A large number of people, including major party, state, and economic leaders, have been forced to stand down in favor of new people...."

Yes, quite a few people of the new type, who reject the bureaucratic and command-based style of leadership and who actively support the party's course of renewal, have joined the leadership of party and people's committees, enterprises and cooperatives, ministries, and entire sectors of the Vietnamese economy. Incidentally, cadre policy is to be the topic of a CPV Central Committee plenum, for which preparation has already begun.

The opponents of glasnost are trying to justify their position by citing difficulties which the country is experiencing at the present stage. However, the CPV leadership has come to the conclusion that it is those difficulties which urgently demand the development of democracy and glasnost. It is believed here that when the people know what has long been kept secret they will better understand the kind of action that the party is asking them to accomplish, and then its decisions will become their cause too.

The development of criticism, attention to working people's letters and suggestions, and the struggle against conservatism, are the main themes in party newspapers and journals. For instance, Hoang Thi Bao, a staff expert of the Hanoi Institute of Marxism-Leninism, writes in NHAN DAN that bureaucracy creates obstacles to glasnost and the entire cause of socialism. As the author says, this is a "vast boulder in the path of democratization in Vietnam." It is only broad democratization and glasnost, the expert continues, which will enable us to end a system of management in the country which has driven the economy along the wrong track, created distorted ideas about the true situation, and violated social justice. The implantation of patriarchal relations, under which the words of the superior leader are perceived as an infallible truth, the author believes, have led to the weakening of party leadership.

CEMA Executive Committee Session Ends

LD2105110188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0625 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] The 127th session of the CEMA Executive Committee has ended in Moscow. It was devoted, among other things, to searching for ways to deepen socialist economic integration. It was noted at the session that the objective course of cooperation among the CEMA countries is leading to the development of higher forms of integration such as direct production links and the establishment of joint enterprises. That is why its participants consider financial and economic levers as encouraging such links. It was also decided to effect the transfer of practical questions of economic cooperation among the participant countries to national economic organizations, with due account being taken of a reduction in the number of CEMA bodies. The CEMA bodies themselves can now concentrate their efforts on drawing up and implementing large-scale programs.

Communique Issued

PM2005101188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 88 Second Edition p 5

["Communique on 127th session of the CEMA Executive Committee"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The 127th session of the CEMA Executive Committee was held in Moscow from 17 to 19 May 1988.

The meeting was attended by the following representatives from the countries in the Executive Committee: Andrey Lukanov, People's Republic of Bulgaria; Jozsef Marjai, Hungarian People's Republic; Tran Duc Luong, SRV; Guenther Kleiber, GDR; Antonio Esquivel, Republic of Cuba; Myatabyn Peljee, Mongolian People's Republic; Wladyslaw Gwiazda, Polish People's Republic; Stefan Andrei, Socialist Republic of Romania; Aleksey Antonov, USSR; Rudolf Rohlicek, CSSR; and Vyacheslav Sychev, secretary of the council.

In accordance with the agreement between the CEMA and the government of the SFRY, Mito Pejovski, the SFRY'S permanent representative in the CEMA, took part in the work of the Executive Committee.

The meeting was chaired by Rudolf Rohlicek, the CSSR representative in the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee's work centered on a discussion of the materials prepared for submission to the next Council session. Those documents include the report on the CEMA'S activity following the 42d CEMA session (1986). The report draws up an initial balance sheet of the work by the CEMA bodies regarding the realization of the decisions of the 43d (extraordinary) Council session for reorganizing the mechanism of multilateral cooperation and of the socialist economic integration of the CEMA member states.

The Executive Committee dealt in detail with the draft collective concept for the international division of labor for 1991-2005, which will also be submitted to the council session.

In preparing for the council session, the Executive Committee approved the long-term program for the development of multilateral specialization and cooperation in the period up to the year 2000 in the spheres of engineering, radio technology, and electronic and chemical industry, and drafts of specific complex programs for multilateral cooperation between the CEMA'S European member states and the SRV, the Republic of Cuba, and the Mongolian People's Republic.

In connection with the forthcoming discussion at the CEMA session on realizing the complex program of scientific-technological progress by the CEMA countries up to the year 2000 and its primary guideline, "Electronification [elektronisierung] of the Economy", an exchange of views took place at the council session concerning certain issues of cooperation in this sphere. Proposals are to be elaborated for a more efficient fulfillment of the tasks arising from the complex program and for solving problems toward its realization.

The Executive Committee analyzed individual issues of perfecting cooperation in the transportation sector, in the communications sector, and in the medical, pharmaceutical, and foodstuffs industries. Agreement was reached on expanding the use of modern computer technology in the joint goods transportation fleet, on formulating measures to develop the production of new types of electrical equipment in the CEMA countries, and the strengthening of multilateral cooperation in the manufacture of medical technology and medication.

The Executive Committee examined and approved for submission to the Council session proposals on further improving the CEMA structure. Measures have been outlined to restructure the CEMA information system so as to enhance its work efficiency.

In fulfilling the tasks of the 43d (extraordinary) meeting of the council, steps were coordinated for perfecting the activity of the multilateral interstate economic and international economic organizations of the CEMA countries, including the transition of some of these organizations to full economic accountability and self-financing in the near future.

The Executive Committee approved plans to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the January 1949 founding of CEMA. The session examined other topical questions on the cooperation of CEMA countries and the council's activities.

The meeting was held in an atmosphere of a frank [otkrovennyy] exchange of opinions and of full mutual understanding.

USSR-U.S. Human Rights Talks Held in Paris

PM2305143588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 May 88 Morning Edition p4

[TASS report: "Press Conference Held"]

[Text] Paris, 22 May—The results of the Soviet-American meeting on human rights held in Paris were the subject of a news conference given here recently by a delegation from the Public Commission on International Cooperation on Humanitarian Problems and Human Rights attached to the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

As emphasized by F. Burlatskiy, head of the Soviet delegation and political observer for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, the meeting was organized as part of preparations for the Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow. At the meeting, the two sides not only set out their position and proposals on human rights problems but also outlined plans for cooperation. The Soviet commission, he stressed, does not confine itself to the international aspects of the fight to guarantee human rights but attaches great importance to solving these problems in the Soviet Union, whereas the U.S. representatives are only concerned with problems of guaranteeing human rights in countries other than their own.

The head of the Soviet delegation went on to point out that despite their differences, the participants in the meeting had managed to reach some agreement on certain issues. The two sides have agreed to implement a series of measures—in particular, they plan to exchange visits by Soviet and American legal experts and information on questions concerning the guarantee of human rights in the United States and the USSR, and they will also be taking steps to galvanize action in support of demands to ratify international human rights agreements.

U.S. Stand at UN Human Rights Debate Scored

LD2105130688 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2000 GMT 20 May 88

[Excerpts] New York, 20 May (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports: Discussion of the human rights issue ended today at the session of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). By and large it was held in a fresh, constructive tone, marked by a desire on the part of most states for serious dialogue in this field. [passage omitted]

The overwhelming majority of speakers wanted the discussions at the United Nations on this important matter to be cut free from fruitless political and ideological confrontation and from attempts to settle bilateral political scores.

However, one of the delegations was evidently not prepared for so serious and constructive an atmosphere. As discussion of this point on the agenda was literally coming to an end, the U.S. delegation launched two speeches in succession, by Richard Williamson, assistant secretary of state, and by Patricia Byrne, U.S. representative to ECOSOC, who attempted to turn the session into an arena for confrontation and blackening all those countries whose political and ideological views do not coincide with those of the United States. They searched out enemies everywhere who need to be chastised and punished. Others, primarily Ethiopia, Cuba, Afghanistan, and the Soviet Union were depicted in exclusively black hues. Only about their own country was not a single word said—as if there are no human rights problems in the United States to be solved, as if suddenly the racism, discrimination against women, genocide of the Indians, had suddenly vanished, as if the homeless had suddenly found a roof over their heads and millions of unemployed had found work and anti-Semitism had gone out of the window.

Such an approach by the United States to human rights problems aroused indignation among the delegates to the ECOSOC session, who classed it as trying to galvanize the approaches of the past, as refusal to understand reality and as a provocative attempt to restore an atmosphere of hostility and confrontation. [passage omitted]

USSR representative I.I. Yakovlev pointed to "an obsence of a real assessment of the real situation" regarding human rights in the position of the U.S. delegation, which had made itself subject to stereotypes of the past. A policy of confrontation and lack of interest in dialogue or sincere cooperation in the sphere of human rights was manifested clearly in it. With its policy of confrontation, the United States is performing a very poor service to the cause of human rights, to the activity of the United Nations, and to the great and responsible tasks of the international community in this area. They require honest cooperation by all states, on a basis of equal rights, and the democratization of each society in the interests of the construction of a better world for man.

Kiev Human Rights Seminar Issues Message

LD2205021788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] The international conference "Human Rights and the Peoples' Rights in the Modern World" has closed in Kiev. The conference participants adopted an address to Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Reagan. They called on the leaders of the two states to pay attention once again to the problem of human rights and make efforts aimed at solving the problems that arise in this area today or may arise in the future. In today's world, which is becoming more and more interconnected and interdependent, in the nuclear age, there is no task more important than restructuring international relations in such a way that confrontation can be replaced with cooperation and conflicts can be resolved through political—and not military—means.

Petrovskiy on Role of Multilateral Diplomacy

PM2305092588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent G. Charodeyev report: "Not Everything Depends on the Two Great Powers. From Our Correspondent at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] A news conference has been held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on the subject of "new political thinking and multilateral diplomacy." The journalists were addressed by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy, who said, in particular:

"The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that in an interdependent world the role of the USSR and the United States can only be creatively peaceful and linking. The normal functioning of the world system of states is impossible without regular and good relations between our countries. The practical deeds of the Soviet Union and the United States, in the military-political sphere above all, are themselves acquiring a qualitatively new dimension in the present situation. There is no doubt that these deeds include the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, which is a product of a correctly and opportunely seized moment of coincidence of the interests of not only the USSR and the United States but also other states. In the final analysis, this agreement embodies the new thinking, one of whose foundations is maximum regard for the mutual interests of countries and peoples.

"This is also the case with the participation of the USSR and the United States in the settlement of regional conflicts and crises. A quite recent example—the Afghan settlement—convincingly attests that the United Nations is capable of helping to resolve the most complex conflicts of the present day. Here, as in disarmament, it is important for all states, including, of course, the Soviet Union and the United States, to cooperate actively with each other, as well as making full use of the UN potential.

"While recognizing the two great powers' special responsibility," V.F. Petrovskiy emphasized, "at the same time, we take account of the fact that far from everything depends on them. The new thinking by which the Soviet Union is guided in its foreign policy practice presupposes the active involvement of both bilateral and multilateral forums and talks equally in the process of shaping an all-embracing system of security. These talks must complement and enrich each other. The successfully developing all-European process is convincing evidence of this. This positive experience could also perfectly well be utilized in other multilateral talks," the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said in conclusion.

Romania's Manescu Addresses Interaction Council

AU2105131988 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 0735 GMT 21 May 88

["The Conception and Initiatives of Romania's President on the Major International Issues Presented in the Interaction Council Session"—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Moscow, AGERPRES, 21/05/1988—The session of the Interaction Council taking place in Moscow, was addressed by Manea Manescu, vice-president of the State Council, who presented the conception and initiatives of President Nicolae Ceausescu of the Socialist Republic of Romania on the major issues of the current international life, the ways and concrete means of settling them in the interests of the peoples, of the cause of peace and security, understanding and collaboration among nations.

Starting from the assessment that international situation remains very grave and complex, as a result of the continuation of the arms race, the persistence of conflicts in various zones of the world and the deepening of the world economic crisis, the speaker pointed out that Romania considers it necessary that more political willingness should be shown in the action for rallying the efforts of all peoples toward disarmament, nuclear disarmament first of all, toward reduction of the conventional armament and military expenditures.

Assessing that the Soviet-American treaty on the liquidation of medium- and shorter-range missiles provides conditions for the Soviet Union and the United States to further negotiate new measures for a substantive reduction of the nuclear weapons, the speaker also stressed that the other powers have to join in these negotiations, so that all nuclear weapons may be gradually eliminated.

Pointing out then the importance of covenanting efficient measures on the cessation of the nuclear tests and of and improvement of these weapons, the banning of the production of chemical weapons and the destruction of the extant stocks, of giving up the space militarization plans, the speaker showed that the general process of negotiations have to be participated in, by far more actively, by all states, irrespective of size or economic and military potential, so that the disarmament measures should reflect the whole international community's political will. Also stressed was the necessity that the resources made available following disarmament and reduction of the military budgets should be used for the benefit of the socio-economic development of all states, especially of the developing ones.

Firm support should be given, the speaker also said, to the creation of demobilized zones, of peace, cooperation and good neighbourliness in the Balkans, northern and central Europe and in other parts of the world.

It was then stressed that the negotiations are the only rational way of settling inter-state litigations and conflicts, and it was pointed out that the settlement of any conflict should start from the need for steady observance of the peoples' rights to independence, to free development, from banning the interference in domestic affairs.

The speaker also stressed that as seen by President Nicolae Ceausescu, the securing of the growth and stability of world economy requires objectively the eradication of underdevelopment and the building of a new international economic order. Emphasis was placed on the need for a global political-economic settlement of the foreign debt issue, that should take account of the economic development level of the debtor countries, of their payment possibilities and the efforts they have made for securing their economic progress.

IAEA's Blix Visits Kazakhstan Nuclear Reactor

LD2300193788 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Alma-Ata May 23 TASS—Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Hans Blix who arrived in the city of Shevchenko, Kazakhstan, gave an interview to reporters at an unusual place, under the steel hood of a fast-neutron nuclear reactor. At the invitation of the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy, he arrived at the Mangyshlak energy complex situated on the Mangyshlak Peninsula washed by the Caspian.

The guest said he was pleased with the familiarization with the only nuclear power station in this zone of the USSR. He said it had been a lucky idea to use a fast-neutron reactor for the production of electricity, steam and drinking water for the development of natural resources of the desert. The degree of reliability and safety of BN-350 (350 megawatt) reactor is not less than that of breeders in other countries and is superior to them for some indexes, he said. The start-up of the reactor took place 15 years ago. The utilization of nuclear fuel in that reactor is accompanied by nuclear fuel breeding. A stable operation of BN-350 has been achieved by its constant upgrading. Specialists of the power complex have modernized fuel elements and steam generators, installed carbon filters of radioactivity and highly effective powders for automatic systems of fire extinguishing. Following the reactor start-up at the Shevchenko nuclear power station, a breeder of almost double capacity went into operation at the Beloyarsk nuclear power station in the Urals.

I got convinced that the average annual radiation dosage of the personnel of the Shevchenko nuclear power station is one thousandths of the permissible norm, while the discharges into the atmosphere by that station are much lower than hygienic limits, Blix said. The fact that thousands of swans and flamingoes inhabited the lake formed by water discharges of the power complex is an indicator of the purity of the environment.

The IAEA director-general said that the agency regards as one of its main tasks a broad exchange of information on accidents at nuclear power stations. The agency's experts on operational safety have already suveyed 25 nuclear power stations in various countries. Late this year they will work at the Rovno nuclear power station, the Ukraine, at the invitation of the Soviet side. This openness to international control will help enhance the population's confidence in the most modern method of generating electricity.

IAEA-CEMA Nuclear Power Safety Meeting Opens

LD2305185088 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The coordination meeting of representatives of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the CMEA member-countries concerned, which has opened here today, is examining problems pertaining to ensuring the safety of operation of nuclear power stations. The meeting is discussing in particular a three-year programme for coordination studies of the probability modelling of accidents for reactors of various types, which was proposed by IAEA a year ago.

In the course of the five-day meeting consultations between representatives of IAEA and CMEA will be held on questions pertaining to a broadening of cooperation between these two international organizations within the framework of implementation of the USSR's proposals on international safeguards in nuclear power engineering.

Further on Chernobyl Nuclear Conference in Kiev

Results Summed Up

AU2005143188 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 14 May 88 p 3

[RATAU report: "A Post-Chernobyl Diagnosis"—boldface as published]

[Text] **The scientific conference on "The medical aspects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES," held in Kiev 11-13 May, met with great interest, both among specialists and in the wide public. It was organized by the USSR Ministry of Health, the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, and the All-Union Scientific Center for Radiation Medicine under the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences. Participating in the conference were our country's prominent scientists engaged in the field of radiology and defense against radiation, health service specialists and organizers from many countries all over the world, representatives of a number of international organizations, including WHO, the IAEA, the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War," and others.** About 140 journalists, including 30 foreign correspondents, were accredited to the conference.

Interest in the Kiev meeting was no accident. After all, the scale of the accident at the Chernobyl AES, notwithstanding the experience of previous tragedies in other countries, proved to be unexpected. For this reason, the country's health services were sharply confronted with very complex problems and difficult tasks involving the protection of the health of the population on the affected territories. These problems called for a scientific interpretation, and for a quick response and efficient decisions.

The lessons of Chernobyl helped us realize that the complexity and diversity of problems concerning the protection of the population during radiation accidents go beyond national frontiers and call for extensive international cooperation.

The conference schedule called for 29 reports which were examined during the discussions. The participants were given the chance to visit the Chernobyl AES, the city of Slavutich built for power engineers, and the All-Union Scientific Center for Radiation Medicine with its clinics.

The guests inspected the P.M. Buyko Scientific Research Institute for Pediatrics, Obstetrics, and Gynecology in Kiev, which has become the leading institute USSR in developing and applying new, effective preventive measures, in the diagnosis and treatment of pregnant women, nursing mothers, babies, and teenagers. The health service scientists and organizers from various countries familiarized themselves with the all-union comprehensive ecological program for research into the effects of the Chernobyl accident and discussed it in detail.

A RATAU correspondent asked G.V. Sergeyev, organizational committee chairman and USSR first deputy minister of health, to sum up the results of the conference on "The Medical Aspects of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES."

"The wide publicity finally given to the main results of the work performed by Soviet scientists in this complex field has to be considered as an important accomplishment of the conference," he said. "In addition, the conference allowed a summing up of the preliminary results of research carried out in a number of sectors, results which generalized the work performed by physicians to eliminate the effects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES. The value of all reports delivered in Kiev was unquestionable. I would divide them into four groups: By virtue of organization and effectiveness, I would group those dealing with the activity of all health services under the first group; those evaluating the radiation situation, under the second; those examining the problems of radiological monitoring following a large-scale accident, under the third; and those directly tackling the medical treatment of people affected by various doses of irradiation, under the fourth group. A separate package of questions was connected with creating the so-called all-union file of persons affected by radiation. This file is unprecedented, because it encompasses about 600,000 persons. A similar file was established in Japan many years after the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

"As far as scientific results are concerned, they have to be viewed in the following sequence. First of all, a number of very serious reports generalized all aspects of the organization and—what is important—effectiveness of the measures taken by physicians in this highly complex situation. It was precisely the scale of the accident which created tasks that we had never expecteded or forecast.

"The reports by L.A. Buldakov, 'The Theory and Practice of Radiation Norm Setting Before and After the Accident'; by K.I. Gordeyev, 'Defense Measures Taken To Reduce the Doses and Effectiveness of Irradiation on the Population'; by A.F. Tsyba and I.A. Likhtarev, 'The Methodical Principles of Calculating the Level of the Internal and External Irradiation of the Population, and the Application of These Data in Operative Decision-making'; by A.K. Guskova and O.A. Pyatak, 'The Sharp Effects of Irradiation Following the Accident at the Chernobyl AES'; and by others were highly interesting.

"Many people in the West are now trying to show that the USSR proved to be unprepared for such an accident. But the conference proceedings were evidence that this was not so. Our measures proved to be effective because they were based on organizational approaches that had been drawn up for the medical services in advance. This was perhaps the most important result of the Kiev meeting because it was the first to thoroughly and scientifically analyze the organizational system of the Soviet health services.

"At the same time, as was correctly noted during the discussion, in eliminating the effects of the accident there were also substantial omissions: Namely, in eliminating the large-scale radiation catastrophe, a comprehensive, systemic approach was nonexistent. Physicians lacked sufficient knowledge in the field of radiation pathology, and radiological services were poorly provided with radiometric instruments. A significant part of the equipment proved to be outdated and out of order. Sanitary information and explanatory work among the population proved to be ineffective.

"I would like to emphasize once again that the conference which has just ended convincingly showed that the experience we accumulated in the truly giant and effective work carried out to eliminate the effects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES is of great importance for science and practice, both in the USSR and all over the world."

The conference participants adopted a statement expressing confidence that the new thinking and the realistic principles of interstate relations based on this thinking would allow nuclear energy to be oriented

toward mankind's benefit. Our optimism, the document reads, is based on the treaty signed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and on the forthcoming Moscow meeting between the leaders of the world's two biggest states.

At the end of the scientific forum, a concluding news conference was held for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Medical Aspects Discussed

AU1805102688 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 12 May 88 p 8

[PAP report: "The Medical Aspects of the Chernobyl Disaster"]

[Text] Kiev. PAP correspondent Jozef Rzeszut writes: A 3-day international scientific conference started in Kiev on Wednesday, devoted to the medical aspects of the disaster at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. It is being attended by 150 Soviet scientists and about 100 specialists from 24 other countries, including Poland, whose delegation is led by Jerzy Bonczak, vice minister of health and social welfare. Hans Blix, director of the IAEA, and representatives from the WHO are also present.

This is the first conference of its kind to discuss the problems facing medicine as a result of the Chernobyl disaster. The effects of Chernobyl will be monitored over a longer period, and in the future there will be mutual exchanges of information about the results of investigations.

Opening the conference, USSR Health Minister Yevgeniy Chazov stressed that as a result of the disaster, the Soviet health service has encountered an unprecedented and complicated case. Radioactive particles have spread over a large area. Health services have proved equal to the task. Some 237 persons were discovered to have acute radiation sickness immediately after the breakdown, and were subjected to intensive treatment. Specialized tests were also carried out on a mass scale on those who had been exposed to radiation. Some 696,000 people had been examined by the end of 1986. An All-Union Center of Radiation Medicine of the USSR Academy of Sciences has been opened in Kiev.

During the past 2 years, experience never before known by the world's doctors has been gathered. Now it must be made available to all mankind.

In his speech, Hans Blix stressed the enormous cost—human and material—of the Chernobyl disaster. Some 31 persons died of radiation, and 100,000 had to be evacuated.

The conclusion from the breakdown is that nuclear energy should not be abandoned. This energy does carry a certain risk, but this risk ought to be compared with economic effects. Classic methods of energy production have disastrous effects on the environment. Therefore, nuclear energy should not be abandoned, but its risk should be reduced. This is the most important conclusion from the Chernobyl breakdown.

The IAEA director general discussed IAEA work on establishing new standards of safety in nuclear energy and its use of the conclusions stemming from the disaster.

During a news conference, Hans Blix said that the world ought to learn as much as possible from the Chernobyl tragedy. From the very beginning, the Soviet side has made information and data widely available to everyone. More and more of the experiences gained in eliminating the effects of the breakdown are becoming the subject of talks by experts.

Gorbachev Greets International Music Festival

LD2105041188 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev sent a message of greetings to the participants and guests of the third international festival "music for humanism, for peace and friendship among nations".

"Your representative meeting is a fresh evidence of the fact that workers in the arts in various countries come increasingly to realise the fact that our complicated world is indivisible, and become increasingly aware of responsibility for the destinies of humanity, the future of civilization.

"The unifying power of music is well-known. It awakens lofty feelings and noble aspirations. With all the diversity of traditions and creative trends, the service to humanistic ideals has been and remains the ultimate aim of true art.

"Our country has profound respect for the cultural legacy of all peoples. Soviet society is open to everything new and talented that serves peace and humankind. I am confident that the spirit of sincere cooperation will be conducive to the festival's success", Mikhail Gorbachev's message says.

Maslennikov Reviews INF Treaty, Afghanistan

PM2305145188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 88 First Edition p 5

[Arkadiy Maslennikov "International Review": "The World This Week"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] The Ice Has Begun To Break [subhead]

News arriving this week from the U.S. capital encouraged a mood of optimism. The juggernaut of the ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles by the U.S. Congress, which appeared to have skidded to a halt, is on the move once more. On Tuesday afternoon, the upper chamber of Congress—the Senate, on which the treaty's ratification ultimately depends—officially embarked on an examination of this question in full session.

It is well known that various aspects of this agreement and the ways and means of its implementation were earlier discussed in detail in the Senate's Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Intelligence Committees. It was at that stage that U.S. legislators raised additional questions concerning mainly technical and procedural questions of verifying implementation of the treaty. Concern on a number of questions, including those concerning verification of Pershing-1A and Pershing-2 missiles on U.S. territory, was also raised in the Soviet Union. These questions were discussed and settled to the sides' general satisfaction at the Geneva meeting between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state. This was yet another confirmation of the viability of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and its ability to provide answers in complex situations.

Speaking at the final sitting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary of State G. Shultz declared that the settlement of mutual complaints eliminates the final obstacles to the treaty's ratification. "By means of this treaty, we are laying a new foundation," the secretary of state emphasized. The treaty's monitoring provisions "are the most detailed and most effective in the entire history of arms control agreements."

On Tuesday, 17 May, President Reagan also called on the Senate to swiftly ratify the treaty. At a White House news conference, the head of the administration expressed the hope that, after a thorough examination, the Senate would approve the treaty, which he described as a "diplomatic landmark."

Many eminent figures in the Senate itself have spoken in favor of the earliest possible ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-and Shorter-Range Missiles in the past few days. For example, Armed Services Committee Chairman Nunn declared in an interview with NBC television that "it is possible and desirable" to complete the process of ratification before the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. "I agree with the secretary of state that this is a good treaty," Senate Republican leader Dole said. "It must be ratified. I hope that we will manage to complete our work by the time the President visits Moscow." Republican Senator Lugar, an influential member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, also described as "perfectly possible" the treaty's approval in the immediate future. "This is important," he emphasized, "from the viewpoint of both our relations with the USSR and our allies' trust in us."

But why is it that things seem to be held up while all, or almost all, influential U.S. leaders agree on the need for immediate ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles? The answer to this question is contained in statements by Senate Democratic Majority leader Byrd. Expressing the hope that the Senate would ratify the treaty before the President's trip to Moscow, he deemed it necessary to make a reservation by saying that this "will depend on the time taken by debates and the number of proposed amendments."

Senator Byrd undoubtedly knew what he was talking about. At the very first session of the Senate, the notorious Helms introduced an obstructionist amendment to refuse to examine the treaty on the grounds that it was signed by... "the leader of a foreign [political] party."

It must be said that, to their credit, the U.S. legislators fittingly rebuffed this provocation: The Helms amendment was rejected by a majority of 91 votes to 6. The Senate also voted down by an overwhelming majority the next amendment, introduced by Republican Senator Simms, who proposed to "link" the entry into force of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles to an "assurance" by the administration that the USSR would adhere to previous arms control accords.

One would like to hope that members of the U.S. Senate will continue to act with an awareness of the responsibility they have to bear. The whole world's public expects them to perform their duty, to advance the cause of nuclear disarmament, and to make the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting in Moscow a truly major event in our relations and in world politics as a whole. [passage omitted]

Let the People Decide [subhead]

Throughout last week the world press, television, and radio paid paramount attention to the development of the situation around Afghanistan in connection with the withdrawal of the Soviet Union's limited contingent of troops from its territory, which has now begun.

Commentaries noted that this event offered further proof of the USSR's responsible approach toward its international obligations, in this case toward the agreements on Afghanistan signed in Geneva on 14 April. "By making this important and courageous decision, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, demonstrated again that his words do not differ from his deeds," FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher declared in Bonn.

The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan is also strictly adhering to the spirit and letter of the Geneva agreements. Consistently pursuing a policy of national

reconciliation, it is creating all the conditions necessary for the return of refugees and for ensuring their peaceful and dignified life in their native land.

Analyzing all these events, many international commentators—including those who have no sympathy for the Afghan revolution—draw the conclusion that the new stage of the development of the situation around Afghanistan offers its people a real opportunity to determine their future by themselves and to choose the path of the country's further development. But, in order for this opportunity to become reality, it is necessary for the other side to adhere equally strictly to the pledges it has made under the Geneva agreements.

This has to be said because, despite verbal assurances and readiness to let the Afghans themselves decide how to live in their own home, the patrons of the so-called "implacables" among the Afghan counterrevolutionary camp are embarking on actions which are totally out of line with the accords reached in Geneva. Journalists reporting from the Afghan-Pakistani border nowadays write that the Afghan opposition's military camps on Pakistani territory are the scene of feverish activity to transfer military supplies to bases deep inside Afghan territory. For example, a correspondent of the Pakistani newspaper THE MUSLIM reported that in just 1 hour on Sunday 15 May—the day when the withdrawal of Soviet troops began—he counted 100 trucks with modern weapons on their way to the Afghan border.

Some hotheads in the U.S. capital, having evidently forgotten the pledges that have been made, openly discuss questions of when the "freedom fighters" they sponsor will capture some Afghan city or other and form a "provisional government." "The mujahidin are promising to make a present of Jalalabad to Congressman Wilson on his birthday, 1 June," journalists were told by an aide of this U.S. figure, who had only just returned from the Afghan-Pakistani border. "It is expected," THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote when reporting this, "that the capture of Jalalabad will be followed by the proclamation of a 'provisional government' by the resistance, which has already named most of its chief officials."

It is obvious, however, that when working out scenarios for future "victories" by their lackeys on Afghan territory, these figures are not taking into account the masters, in other words, the Afghan people themselves. The best informed Western specialists admit that the possibility of detachments financed by Washington gaining control of the situation in Afghanistan appears, to say the least, problematic. S. Harrison, famous U.S. expert on Afghanistan's problems, does not rule out the possibility that parties from the Peshawar-based "alliance of seven" and leaders of detachments operating inside the country, once they encounter resistance from the government forces, whose combat ability has significantly increased during the years of revolution, will quarrel with each other and will be unable to pose any serious threat to the legitimate government in Kabul. Nonetheless, it would be inappropriate to underestimate their ability to engage in subversive activity and to organize armed attacks and other subversive actions.

As a matter of fact, the Western patrons of the "implacables" are really playing with fire. According to available reports, their lackeys receive Stinger antiaircraft missiles from the United States and resell them to Iranian smugglers operating in the provinces of Baluchestan and Kerman. In April of this year alone, 32 Stingers changed hands in Baluchestan. A further 10 were sold to another group of smugglers operating near the Iranian city of Zahedan.

The recipients of these weapons pay 13 million Iranian rials ($160,000) for every missile. The Afghan "fighters" also supply Iranian smugglers with large-caliber antiaircraft machineguns. What would people in Western capitals say if their own military and civilian aircraft were shot down as a result of the use of these weapons?

Official statements by Washington and Islamabad spokesmen are not short of assurances of willingness "to let the Afghan people themselves determine what government they want to have." There is a shortage of just one thing—backing up of these good words by deeds. The essence of the Geneva agreements signed by representatives of the United States and Pakistan is simple and understandable: Afghanistan's future must be decided by Afghan people themselves, and by them alone. The more reliably this is guaranteed, the more quickly peace will dawn on the war-torn Afghan land and the more stable the situation will be in this part of the globe. [passage omitted]

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Soviet-U.S. Moscow Summit

Shultz Comments

LD2305121688 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] New York May 23 TASS—In his replies to the questions of THE WASHINGTON POST and NEWSWEEK magazine, Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, touched upon many subjects and "in terms of tone, it's quite apparent that he wants to see things move forward," said U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz in an ABC programme "This Week With David Brinkley." He also described it as "an interesting interview."

At the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow, Shultz said further, both sides would "want to agree to keep working" hard on the START treaty which might be concluded before the end of the term of the current administration.

Human Rights 'First' on Agenda

LD2405105588 Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—Among the issues on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. dialogue in the last three years that of human rights has moved up from the fourth to the first place and will become one of the central points on the agenda of the forthcoming summit meeting in the Soviet capital, said Andrey Grachev, head of a section in the propaganda department of the CPSU Central Committee. He took part today in a press conference on Soviet attitude to human rights issues and humanitarian cooperation. This change reflects the evolution of political discussions between Soviet and U.S. leaders and the significance which the two countries attach to humanitarian problems, he said.

At the same time, Andrey Grachev drew the attention of journalists to the fact that there were difficulties recently in the discussion of human rights issues. "I think that there was more mutual suspicions, mistrust, prejudice and simple misunderstanding, at times even rejection of the position and arguments of each other, in this field than in military-strategic issues. At some stage, it seemed that this area was in a sense hopeless for diplomatic talks: It was too close to irreconcilable ideological positions, to opposing social systems and the off-repeated argument that simply raising the human rights issue constituted interfering in the internal affairs of the other side."

Andrey Grachev stated with satisfaction that the atmosphere itself and tone of talks on human rights had now changed. The asymmetry, which arose after many Western, especially American, representatives believed that they were the side which asked questions and the Soviet union was the side to provide accounts and answers, is being rectified. "Discussions on these issues are becoming a road with two-way traffic, which can become the only one leading to better understanding in this complex, but very important field, since it affects the interests and lives of millions of people on both sides of the ocean," he stressed.

"The USSR did quite a lot to travel its stretch of the road," Andrey Grachev continued. "I mean, first and foremost, the processes of democratization, glasnost and restructuring which are taking place in Soviet society."

In the field of human rights and humanitarian cooperation "a mechanism is being currently built for ascertaining mutual grievances, which will gradually turn into a mechanism for building mutual trust between the USSR and USA," the speaker said, "the trust, without which, in the final analysis, it will be impossible to move on to the other topics of Soviet-U.S. relations, including security issues."

Poll Shows 'Keen Interest'

LD2405123788 Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—Soviet people show a keen interest in the upcoming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Moscow, according to the findings of a public opinion poll taken in 12 regions in the Russian Federation, the largest Soviet constituent republic.

The interest is explained by the belief, held by 92 percent of the respondents, that Soviet-U.S. summits are of much importance to easing international tension and preserving peace.

A total of 1,000 people were interviewed in the poll by the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of Sociological Surveys as part of the international peace barometer project which provides for periodic sampling of public opinion on the more important issues.

Speaking of the present state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United states, 8.3 percent of those polled described them as "good," 67 percent as "satisfactory," and 6 percent as "bad," while 18.6 percent had difficulty making up their minds.

The poll also showed Soviet people believing that the previous summits have led to certain positive shifts in the bilateral Soviet-American relationship.

Asked to describe these changes since the summits in Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington, 9.1 percent of the respondents said these have been "profound and irreversible," 66 percent regard them as "significant but

unstable," and 9.6 percent as "superficial and provisional", while 3.4 percent take the view that "there have been no changes and everything is just as it used to be" and 11.9 percent had difficulty giving the answer.

A considerable part of those polled pointed at the same time to fundamental disagreements between the USSR and the United States on a number of problems.

In particular, 65.8 percent noted such disagreements in the issue of a complete end to nuclear testing, 62.2 percent saw them in the issue of weapons deployments in outer space, and 57 percent in the issue of a complete elimination of nuclear arms.

Journalists Arrive

LD2105161688 Moscow TASS in English 1532 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS—More than 5,000 Soviet and foreign journalists are expected to be accredited at the press centre of the Soviet-American summit meeting, a TASS correspondent was told today by Yuriy Grimitskykh, first deputy head of the information directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

"There, perhaps, has never been such a large number of journalists in the Soviet capital. This interest in the forthcoming event is explained by the tremendous significance of the summit for normalizing relations between the USSR and the USA and the international situation as a whole," he noted.

Officially, the press centre will start functioning on May 23. The Soviet side is planning to hold a number of meetings and press conferences to enable the foreign guests get miscellaneous information about life in the Soviet Union, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said. Beginning from May 29, the first day of the meeting, it is planned to hold daily briefings and press-conferences in whose course Soviet and American officials will brief the pressmen on the course of the summit meeting.

Foreign newsmen have been already arriving in Moscow. Thus a large group of representatives of American radio and television companies is already at work.

To cater best for such a large number of journalists the press centre will function in several premises: at the International Trade Centre on the bank of the Moskva River, the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry in Zubovskiy Square and the Electronic Press Centre in Ostankino. On top of that, a subsidiary of the Ostankino Electronic Press Centre will be the Hotel Rossiya, where Western TV Companies have converted 150 suits into temporary studios from where news from Moscow will be beamed through communication satellites to the respective countries.

All the premises of the press centre are equipped with telephone, telex, and electronic communication facilities. It is also planned to arrange for the sale of souvenirs with the symbol of the meeting, the newspaper and magazines of the major countries of the world.

Moscow is preparing for a history-making event.

Press Center for Upcoming Moscow Summit Opens

LD2305122688 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The press centre of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has started its work, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said today. On May 23-28, press conferences will be held there with Soviet representatives discussing a wide range of home and foreign policy issues.

"The renewal of social, political and intellectual life in the USSR" is the subject of today's press conference which features Tatyana Zaslavskaya, director of the All-Union Centre for the Study of Public Opinion and Socio-Economic Problems at the AUCCTU and the USSR State Committee for Labour, Sergey Zalygin, editor-in-chief of the NOVY MIR magazine, Fyodor Burlatskiy, vice president of the Soviet Association of Political Sciences, and Leonid Abalkin, director of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Economist Abalkan Speaks

LD2305154588 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—"The development of Soviet society is determined by two interrelated processes—a radical economic reform and the deepening of democracy. One cannot exist without the other," Leonid Abalkin, director of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said in the press centre for the Soviet-American summit meeting. The press centre opened here today.

Speaking at a press conference on "renewal of sociopolitical and spiritual life in the USSR," he noted that "a deep meaning of a radical reform of the management is to create an economic foundation for the democratization of Soviet society".

It is intended to preserve in the Soviet Union all the social guarantees that the socialist system gave them and at the same time to sharply increase the differentiation in pay so that the material standards of every person, of every work collective should depend only on end results," he said.

"We wish to give free play to flexible forms of regulation by means of the socialist market without losing the advantages of the economic guidance by planning. The

USSR wishes to preserve a state with its centralized functions and to grant a collective full rights of self-management," Leonid Abalkin said.

Burlatskiy Speaks

LD2305184688 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1211 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 May (TASS)—One can say that the main victory of the restructuring of all sides of socioeconomic life in the USSR, which has been continuing for 3 years, is the fact that all of Soviet society has now gone into motion. Such phenomena as the development of glasnost, democratization, and economic reforms have become nationwide property, Fedor Burlatskiy, vice president of the Soviet Association of Social Sciences said today before Soviet and foreign journalists in the press center of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, which will begin 29 May in Moscow. The press conference was devoted to questions concerning the renewal of the sociopolitical and spiritual life of the USSR.

As one of the main obstacles faced by the restructuring of Soviet society, Fedor Burlatskiy named the resistance to the processes of deep changes on the part of those who would like to confine themselves simply to insignificant permutations in the already-formed social and economic structures. Another serious difficulty is a certain imbalance which has arisen between the development of such phenomena as glasnost and democratization, and the course of the economic reforms. "If democratization and glasnost have by now firmly entered the lives of Soviet people," he said, "economic reforms are only taking their first steps."

The 19th all-union party conference, which is to be held this summer, should make a great contribution to speeding up social and economic developments in the USSR, Fedor Burlatskiy noted.

'First' News Conference

LD2305221288 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1937 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] [Announcer] In Moscow today the press center of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting opened. As Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, announced to Soviet and foreign journalists, during the whole of the coming week Soviet spokesmen will hold meetings with the press here every day, the subjects of which will be various questions of both the domestic life and foreign policy of our country.

Taking part in today's first news conference were: Sergey Zalygin, editor-in-chief of the journal NOVYY MIR, Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya, director of the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion and Socioeconomic Problems; Fedor Burlatskiy, vice president of the Soviet Political Sciences Association; and Leonid Abalkin, director of the Economics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The subject of the news conference is the renewal of social, political, and spiritual life in the USSR.

[Begin recording] [Burlatskiy] Well, you know that in connection with the 19th party conference, the results of these 3 years, 3 years of restructuring, are being reviewed. The main gains and problems which have emerged in the course of restructuring are being appraised. If we are to speak of the main gain, then it is most probably the fact that society has been set in motion, not simply one's own society, so to speak, not simply the tip of the iceberg, but all of our society. Glasnost, democratization, the first steps of the economic reforms, are more and more becoming the property of the entire nation. If one is to speak of the main problems and difficulties then I would name at least two—two difficulties, two problems. The first is the problem of resistance, and this has moved to the plane of difficulties of forming socialist pluralism. From my point of view, the main struggle is being waged between the adherents of structural, revolutionary, really profound transformations, and those who would like to limit themselves to small organizational or cadre changes.

The second difficulty, from my point of view, is connected with a certain asymmetry—most probably also inevitable—between the process of glasnost, democratization, and the progress of the economic reforms. Glasnost and democratization have received very stormy development in this period and the economic reforms have made only their first steps. The real results which are awaited by the Soviet man-in-the-street, in the sphere of the economy, in change at work, in material benefits, the opportunity to receive more for better work, are not great as yet. I think the 19th party conference will try to solve these and other questions which are extraordinarily important for our society.

[Abalkon] We are speaking of two interrelated processes which define our development. They are radical reform of the management of the economy and the development of democracy. You cannot have one without the other. We clearly understand today that without radical economic reform there can be no genuine democracy—not just glasnost but real self-management of the people. Any democracy has an economic foundation, basis. It assumes the security, the economic security of the individual, of the collective, against any arbitrary rule, against any voluntarism. But the right path has been chosen, a path which has been approved by the people, a path which will, I repeat, not be easy to follow, but which will lead to the aims, to the fulfillment of the aims which were set at the beginning of the transformations.

[Zaslavskaya] The tasks which have been set before society by our political leadership demand a genuine revolutionary transformation of the entire system of social relations in the country. And when restructuring

develops fully—and it really is gathering full strength—it must grow into a social revolution. It seems to me, however, that it would be very dangerous to portray what is desired as what really exists, and already to regard as a social revolution those transformations which have been carried out so far, and which are being carried out at the present. I think that the totality of the measures which we have managed to implement in the past few years should be more correctly regarded as a reform, a not very comprehensive reform based upon many compromises, and which must, of course, be made very much more vitally radical and profound. [end recording]

[Announcer] Then questions were posed. Some of them boiled down to the following: Is genuine democratization of society possible in the conditions of a one-party system?

[Begin recording] [Burlatskiy] The struggle which has begun in society is being waged wholly upon the ground of socialism and our constitution. It is another matter that currently the very notion of socialism is changing. In this sense, we are living through the same sort of period as our society experienced after the transfer from war communism to the new economic policy. The outlook on socialism is changing. Doubt has been cast upon what previously constituted the yardstick of socialism, which took shape from the 1930's-1950's; and the party and society are seeking new criteria for understanding socialism. This, of course, is setting minds in motion, and engendering human passions, when some people propose setting up a new party in our country. The leading role of the Communist Party is not just the historic tradition of 70 years: It is the constitutional norm. I would only like to stress that all the initiatives for restructuring proceed from the party.

[Correspondent Jozsef Barath] Jozsef Barath, Hungarian radio correspondent. A question for Academician Zaslavskaya: There is a great deal of talk at the moment about socialist pluralism. But in order for this to be not only freedom for discussion, an appropriate system of political institutions is needed, through which these interests can be expressed and come up against one another. How do you see the future of these institutions?

[Zaslavskaya] It seems to me that one of the reasons why restructuring has been developing insufficiently rapidly, is the diffusiveness of the forces of its supporters, its most active supporters, ideologists, those people who are trying to use their creative activity to apply, so to speak, new approaches and new methods, and develop them further. I think that the Communist Party could be very well augmented by a number of new public formations.

[Unnamed correspondent] TASS economic editorial board. I have a question for Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin. My question is this and it concerns the legal basis of the economic transformations being introduced in the Soviet Union. Many of the economic laws designed to consolidate the changes which have begun have failed to prove their worth—this is already obvious now. What is to happen to these laws in future, in particular the law on state enterprise? And secondly, will lessons be drawn from compiling these (?protolaws) when new ones are compiled?

[Abalkin] Of course, when these were drawn up, given the time and historical experience, a whole series of shortcomings crept in. The articles of the laws themselves were to a certain degree the result of a compromise, a compromise between the supporters of revolutionary changes and those of liberal transformations. This finds reflection in the way they are used in practice. What is to happen to these laws in the future? We are facing a very difficult question, a political question: Can the law be changed every year? I do not think it is possible to act in that way today. Confidence in the force of the law is needed. There must be no fuss and pettiness in implementing these laws, lessons must be drawn for the future. And an example of drawing lessons in this way is the work on the law which the USSR Supreme Soviet will start to debate tomorrow, the law on coproduction. [end recording]

'Top Priority' Views 'Presummit Fever'

LD2105170288 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 20 May 88

["Top Priority" program, presented by Vladimir Pozner with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov]

[Excerpts] [Pozner] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. This is Vladimir Pozner presenting "Top Priority." With me on the panel: Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov, and it's been a while since we've been together, has it not?

[Bogdanov] It is a while, really a while, but I would like to inform our American listeners that Vladimir Pozner spent qutie a number of weeks in the States. [passage omitted]

[Pozner] Dr Plekhanov, you've just returned from a rather long trip to the United States and Canada, so that we're all back from wherever we were, and of course the theme today, the subject is...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] We, we are at last together.

[Pozner] Yes, finally. And of course, our subject today is presummit fever, let's put it that way. But I would like to begin with something that has, that is not directly linked to the summit but is of importance: the debates on the INF Treaty in the U.S. Senate, and what I see as a very slow pace of the way this, er, the ratification process has evolved in the United States. As one senator put it, Senator James Exon, a Democrat of Nebraska, he said: We drag and drag and drag, and we voted today on a totally meaningless amendment, this is of the essence, er,

time is of the essence here, let's go, let's do our work, let's not fool around. My question: Why are they fooling around? What do you think?

[Bogdanov] Look, we have been discussing that problem so many times...

[Pozner, interrupting] Really?

[Bogdanov] ...that I don't feel like coming back to that again. Let me put it...

[Pozner, interrupting] ... in a nutshell...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] ... in a nutshell, they will ratify it. Would you like to have a bet with me?

[Pozner] I agree.

[Bogdanov] They're making, you know, their own accounts with their own President, with his administration. We have nothing to do with that, but of course, we would like to see American President coming here with...

[Pozner, interrupting] ...a signed, ratified treaty?

[Bogdanov, interrupting] ...a signed, ratified. But if he doesn't bring that with him we will not die, they will rather suffer, we...

[Pozner, interrupting] But, but, why are they, what's the problem? I mean, why suddenly, or rather not suddenly, but why this dragging on with something that is so obvious? What do you think, Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] I agree with Dr Bogdanov that the reasons are primarily domestic, political. It's the politics inside the U.S. Congress and in relations between the administration and the U.S. Congress. Number one, this is a political year and this is an election and the Democrats want to win, and therefore, there's a lot of political poachery [as heard] when the Congress wants to be seen as a coequal branch of government with the administration and...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] And you have a Democratic majority in both houses.

[Plekhanov] Absolutely, absolutely. And that, of course, is (?felt) not to let people think that it's just the President, and that there are a lot of people on Capitol Hill who also want to be part of the action, and that's alright. Another thing is that you see, this conflict between the administration and the legislative has deep roots. The administration as encountered opposition in the U.S. Congress on a number of its foreign policy initiatives, like aid to the contras, for instance, interpretation of the ABM Treaty, a number of weapons sytems, funding for SDI. So there is a backlog of differences between the two branches on foreign policy and I think that is projected on the fate of the INF Treaty, because one of the issues has to do with whether the administration, any administration, has a right to reinterpret the treaty which the Senate has ratified in the form it was signed. We've had this problem with the ABM Treaty and I think the administration has sort of laid a booby trap under the INF Treaty by fooling around with the interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

[Pozner] Right, yeah. Do you think it's going to be ratified?

[Plekhanov] Oh, I'm sure about that.

[Bogdanov] Would you like to have a bet with us, Vladimir?

[Pozner] I think you want to take my money away. Tell me.

[Bogdanov] I would not deny that.

[Pozner] Dr Plekhanov, briefly, your impressions after your visit to the United States. What is the, if you can make that guess, what is the feeling today among Americans vis-a-vis relations with the Soviet Union? Do you notice a change at all?

[Plekhanov] Absolutely, I do, because in the past 2 or 3 years there's been a very important change in the structure of American public opinion concerning relations with the Soviet Union on key issues of security, arms reduction...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Sergey, would you specify that, would you give a specific example that, that you have told me? I would think it would be of great interest to our American listeners what you witness yourself.

[Plekhanov] Well, one particularly moving illustration was to hear a southern Baptist preacher in a church...

[Pozner, interrupting] Whereabouts?

[Plekhanov] Er, in Washington D.C., praising the Lord for perestroyka in the Soviet Union because perestroyka in the Soviet Union does have an international meaning. Changes in the Soviet Union are popular with the, with the bulk of American people.

[Pozner] You mean actually speaking from the pulpit? And praising the Lord for this? So, did you...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yes, yes, yes, because, because perestroyka in the Soviet Union, the policies of Mikhail Gorbachev, Gorbachev and the Soviet leadership, the current Soviet leadership, open up new vistas that make people more hopeful that not only there will be the 21st century, but that it will be a more reasonable and a happier time for all mankind.

[Pozner] Er, did you say Amen?

[Plekhanov] Er, well, since it was a southern Baptist church, I don't think we were supposed to say Amen.

[Pozner] Well, did you say hallelujah?

[Plekhanov] Well, we sang, we sang, "Amazing Grace." [laughs]

[Pozner, laughs] Alright, okay, fine, fine. Er, let's take a look at what is happening now. When you look at the American news nowadays there seems to be a tendency, at least on the part of some, to talk of over summitry, that there's too much noise now, that there's going to be a lot of noise about the summit, and the reason there's going to be a lot of noise about the summit is because nothing is really going to happen, so that over summitry is a way to hide the lack of substance. What do you say to that?

[Bogdanov] Well, on one hand it's a very healthy, very healthy reaction to the summitry because now it is not something extraordinary that you may expect, you may not expect. Is the fact, is bound to happen, because summitry is inbuilt part now in the Soviet-American relations, and you cannot expect everytime from that fact, very important, but usual fact, if you like. I wouldn't say ordinary fact, no, it's very important, but I mean, it's inbuilt already, it's an integral part of the Soviet-American relations. So it's a work, if you like, that's my belief, it's a working summit when people meet to work out the last details of something, to go ahead with some other thing, and to sign some third thing. So.

[Pozner] What you're saying then is that a summit is not necessarily when you, when you have to sign something mind boggling, that summits between the leaders of the two countries can occur on a regular basis.

[Bogdanov] Look, Vladimir, Vladimir, what is the history of the Soviet-American summitry if you like. At every summit you have something extraordinary, why? Because in between them you have sometimes between 5, 6, 7 years or even 12 years. Now you have four summits, one after another. Do you expect our statesmen, leaders, our leaders, at each summit to produce something dramatic? No, they should not! They should not. After all, what's the most important part of the happening, if you like, in the Soviet-American relations is that they're getting into the solid base, into the solid, they didn't get, but they are getting on the solid base. What does it mean, the solid base? It means that they will be (?developing) even without summit.

[Pozner] Tell me...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] They will have their own. Do you see my point, what I mean?

[Pozner] I see your point but what I wanted to ask you, perhaps Dr Plekhanov, is do you think that this tendency to speak of over summitry as a way of hiding lack of substance, do you think that's an effort, perhaps, on the part of some to, as it were, undermine the importance of the summit?

[Plekhanov] Yes, well, I've seen it happen in the past. There was the same kind of downplaying of the importance of the Geneva summit for instance. I remember very vividly the commentary by George [name indistinct], for instance, who was trying to pooh-pooh the summit (?saying) oh no, you know, no real treaties, we've seen it all before, and so on. I think even an atmospheric—quote, unquote—summit is important since the process of improvement, process of normalization of Soviet-American relations, has been set in motion, and as any process it requires certain incentives.

[Pozner] Let me ask you something immediately. Do you think that there are forces in the United States that are uncomfortable with what you call, with this process that your're speaking about, and by the same token, do you think that there are forces in the Soviet Union that are uncomfortable?

[Bogdanov] I do not, I do not agree with your question.

[Pozner] How can you not agree with that?

[Bogdanov] There are not, I'm sorry to say, you are our boss, I dared to disagree with you because I, I, I cannot accept that formulation; they feel uncomfortable. They, that is [words indistinct] I would put it that way.

[Pozner] Alright, you're saying that there are groups in the United States that have a strong vested interest in keeping our relationship bad. What I'm asking you is do you think that's true? By the same token, do you think that there are people, forces, groups, call them what you want in the Soviet Union who also have their own interests in keeping the relationship bad?

[Plekhanov] Well, as far as the United States side is concerned it's obvious that there are groups there which are fearful of the summit. I think the far right in the United States, the extreme conservatives, are watching with dismay the situation which they thought was very much under their control and very much in their favour politically slipping out of their hands. The image of the Soviet Union as an evil empire has played such an important role in the way they view the world; it's one of the moorings of their political outlook. Now, that mooring has been gone, the chain has been broken and as a result, you know, the ship of state is moving in another direction so they watch it with dismay, and I think that they're very unhappy and there's a lot of vested interest connected with that: arms manufacturing people, er...

[Bogdanov] Sergey, I still object that word unhappy. You are too polite, you are very well brought up, I know that, but you're too polite.

[Pozner] Diplomatic, alright?

[Bogdanov] Diplomatic, you're too diplomatic. They hate all that, that is, that is deadly for them.

[Pozner] Yeah, alright. What about the other side? What about...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] What about the other side? Let me put that question to you my dear Vladimir because you've been doing a great job of trying to, with success, to improve the Soviet-American environment which is to my mind, sometimes is more important. Do you get some letters?

[Pozner] Oh yes.

[Bogdanov] Do you get some telephone calls? Do you get some, some hostile behavior? Yes, that's why I'm putting this question to you.

[Pozner] Yes, yes, a lot, yes. I have got a certain amount of negative reaction from people who see me as being someone who is trying to destroy the stereotypes that exist vis-a-vis the United States and the American people, and I believe that this exists not only at a grassroots level, that there are average people who are uncomfortable, I will use that word, with that type of thing. I also happen to think that there are more powerful people who would prefer to have a tense relationship between the two countries.

[Bogdanov] Let me, let me give you another example of my personal [word indistinct]. I happen to lecture sometimes at some rather high auditorium and, you know, when I start talking the truth, let me put it that way, the objectivity, I see some people, some people standing up and leaving the auditorium. They don't like to listen to what I am saying.

[Plekhanov] Right, because you're destroying the framework of their thinking.

[Bogdanov] I, Sergey, yes, but you know, they cannot accept this.

[Plekhanov] Absolutely, that's what I'm saying because...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] They cannot accept it to that extent that they prefer to leave the, the, the...

[Pozner, interrupting] There is no doubt that among the people who could not accept it, I would say we would have to count President Reagan, the man who called this country the evil empire, the man who called this country the center of all evil, the man who in a radio test spoke about having commanded his bombers to bomb this place within the next 5 minutes, and so on, and yet a man today, who just recently in an interview spoke about Mr Gorbachev as his friend, and spoke about being reasonably optimistic in so far as relationships between these two countries go. Do you think that's an important change for a man like President Reagan?

[Bogdanov] Look, I believe, I don't know, I don't know whether Sergey will agree with me or not, but now at the end of his term I come to the very first, very firm conclusion he is very, number one, he is very American President, maybe the most American President [chuckles] in the post World War II history in a very good sense of that word, by the way. Number two, this President is a very honest man, let me say that, honest man with very honest, you may not agree with his beliefs, but he's an honest man. And number three, he will have his place, he's maybe already saving his place in the American history. It will be...

[Pozner, interrupting] When you call, when you call him very American could you specify very briefly what you mean by that.

[Bogdanov] Very, I mean by that, that it's a kind of a, it's a kind of a contradictions in one man, in it's a kind of many things in one, you know, that's what I mean by, by, in his specific case.

[Pozner] Dr Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] I think that President Reagan has changed his views of the Soviet Union and that has been a reflection of the real changes that are going on in, inside the Soviet Union.

[Pozner] Do you think that's important?

[Plekhanov] I think that's important, I figure that's one of the results.

[Bogdanov] That's what we may call the Soviet factor.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, the Soviet factor, well, look, there is more and more conviction in political circles and the public opinion in the West, and not only in the West, that the Soviet Union is really building something like a new model of socialism, one which is more understandable, more acceptable, more attractive to people outside the Soviet Union, something which is seen as, as, as really a better society, a freer society, a more democratic society, and I think that is having an effect both on the thinking of Reagan and on the thinking of other people.

[Pozner] Well, let me wind up by saying hallelujah and inviting all of our listeners to tune in a week from today for another issue of "Top Prority." It was great to be with you; we'll be speaking to you at the same time a week from today.

U.S. To Receive Summit Television Progam

PM2305125188 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 21 May 88 p 2

[TASS report: "United States: VREMYA in American..."]

[Text] Over 30 million American families will be able to watch the VREMYA news program each evening for the duration of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow. A 1-hour program provisionally entitled "How They See It: Soviet Evening News Program" will be shown at 2100 hours.

The VREMYA program will be received via satellite link at the "Discovery" studio in Alexandria, VA, where it will be recorded, edited into the 1-hour format, and translated into English. The program's moderator will be the well-known U.S. journalist Hodding Carter, former assistant secretary of state.

Further Moscow Presummit Comments, Reports

CNN Interviews Howard Baker

LD2205091888 Moscow TASS in English 0839 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] New York May 22 TASS—TASS correspondent Anatoliy Lazarev reports:

Howard Baker, White House chief of staff, appearing in a program of the Cable New Network (CNN) on Saturday, said meetings between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union are always important to all aspects of bilateral relations and provide opportunities for their development in all directions.

"I think," he pointed out, "this summit will be significant as the other three have been. Perhaps even more significant."

Mr Baker voiced hope that President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev "will be able to exchange ratification documents on the INF agreement."

He said the Senate would ratify the Soviet-U.S. Treaty by an overwhelming majority of votes of representatives of the two parties and, in his view, that may occur in the coming days.

In answer to the question whether the President had any hope whether substantial progress concerning an agreement on a reduction in strategic offensive arms would be achieved at the summit, Mr Baker said: "He certainly hopes for that. And certainly, the continuation of our efforts to make progress on START will be a major item on the agenda."

The White House chief of staff pointed out that the Soviet Union and the United States are "custodians of arsenals of nuclear weapons that can annihilate humanity." They have got mutual obligations to avoid that.

Mr Baker also said that not only arms control issues but also a wide range of other problems would be discussed at the summit. Among these he mentioned the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, human rights, the freedom of religion, the possibility to reduce the risk of non-nuclear, chemical and bacteriological wars as well as economic issues. Such a discussion, in Mr Baker's view, will meet the interests of the two countries.

Fitzwater on Preparations

LD2105144588 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Washington May 21 TASS—Preparations for the Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow have entered the concluding stage. Assistant to the President for press relations Marlin Fitzwater reported to journalists on Friday the main elements of the official program of President Ronald Reagan's stay in the Soviet Union. He is due to arrive in the Soviet Union for a visit on May 29.

As was noted by the White House representative, leaders of the two countries will have five official meetings in the Kremlin. The U.S. President will also meet public representatives, professionals, speak to students and teachers of the Moscow State University.

All four cardinal problems of the Soviet-American relations, namely: various aspects of the process of limitation of armaments, bilateral relations, regional conflicts and human rights are to be thoroughly studied and discussed at the Moscow negotiations, said U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. It is quite possible that some progress will be attained on each of them, he said in the course of a press conference for West European and Canadian journalists, held by the Worldnet T.V. channels on Friday.

Not only problems of strategic and space armaments, but also "undoubtedly", chemical weapons, measures of building up East-West confidence, questions linked with conventional forces and armaments are to be discussed during the Mosow summit negotiations, George Shultz said.

George Shultz meanwhile noted that accords on a 50-per cent reductions in strategic arsenals of both countries would not be signed at the Moscow meeting. It has become absolutely clear now that we shall be enable to elaborate in time for the summit meeting the final agreement on reduction of strategic armaments, now being worked on, Shultz said. But, he said, the Moscow meeting documents are sure to reflect in some form the significant progress which was attained at these negotiations in recent years.

The secretary of state expressed the hope that the U.S. Senate would give its approval for ratification of the INF Treaty before the beginning of President Reagan's official visit to the Soviet Union.

Zholkver on U.S. Attitude

LD2005215688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 May 88

[Commentary by station political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The U.S. press forecasts that the Moscow meeting will discuss the whole spectrum of vital issues in world politics—from Soviet-U.S. relations to regional conflicts. Yet most attention is now, perhaps, being devoted to the issues involved in restraining the arms race. These issues are now doubly topical for the United States, since the U.S. Senate has finally started, after 4 months of committee scrutiny, to discuss the ratification of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Along this hard road, as THE NEW YORK TIMES put it, the first obstacle has been surmounted. Senator Helms failed to block the examination of the treaty, and the vast majority of senators rejected the first amendments designed to kill it.

However, as the U.S. press admits, there are still quite a few traps that have been laid in the Senate. At any rate, Republican Senate leader Dole has said that it is time to roll up the shirtsleeves and set to work so as to ratify the treaty before President Reagan departs for Moscow. Assistant Secretary of State Ridgway also called for this in her speech to the Senate.

I would like to add that many of the United State's NATO allies—and not just public figures, but statesmen too—are insistenty advising the senators to speed up the ratification. Generalizing these comments, the WORLD POLICY JOURNAL, the organ of the New York-based World Policy Institute, writes that the Europeans regard the INF Treaty as a window to a new order for ensuring security in Europe and as the beginning of a wider process of disarmament and detente. The central task of the process now is to make progress toward working out an agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons while observing the ABM Treaty. Of course, the problem is more complicated than just the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles and a section of the U.S. press is pessimistic about it. Moreover, it is no secret that the U.S. military-industrial complex is in no way disposed to part with the profitable nuclear missile business.

Only the other day, the Pentagon announced that two vast concerns, Westinghouse Electronic and Rockwell International, had been awarded a new $329 million order for MX intercontinental missiles. Nevertheless, albeit not easily and not simply, new political thinking is making headway across the ocean too. In his last interview, at any rate, President Reagan stressed in particular that there can be no victors in a nuclear war and so it should not be waged. The President declared his intention to continue, in Moscow, the dialogue on reducing nuclear weapons, with particular stress on strategic offensive systems.

As for the Soviet Union, I would remind you that one of the regular sessions of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo confirmed the intention of the Soviet side to do everything necessary to ensure that the forthcoming meeting marks an important stage along the road toward a package of agreements on strategic offensive weapons and anti-missile defenses.

U.S. Senate Resumes Debate on INF Treaty

LD2305185488 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Washington May 23 TASS—By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy:

The U.S. Senate today resumed its debate on the Soviet-American treaty to abolish intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

Speaking in a CBS morning news show, Democratic Senator Dale Bumpers said that even the treaty's opponents admitted to themselves it was a good agreement meeting U.S. security interests and laying down a good foundation for a strategic arms reduction treaty.

He added: "The treaty is going to be approved by the Senate. It's just a question of whether we do it before or after the summit."

"It's in our interest to proceed with the INF Treaty's ratification," Republican Senator William Cohen said in a CBS interview.

He said that he thought action was unlikely before Ronald Reagan left for Moscow Wednesday, but it was "still possible that the treaty could be ratified while he's there".

Charles Percy, former chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations who now heads a private legal consultancy, said in THE WASHINGTON TIMES today that the INF Treaty had gone a long way to its ratification.

With the last hurdles to its approval cleared, the Senate, he said, now had an opportunity to secure substantial progress in arms control.

President Reagan in his weekly radio address last Saturday said he hoped that "the Senate will provide its consent to ratification of the INF Treaty in time to bring it into force during my meetings with the general secretary (Gorbachev) in Moscow.

This is wanted also by the vast majority of American lawmakers, but a small group of Conservative Republicans led by Senator Jesse Helms are eager to drag out the debate, by taking advantage of their procedural rights.

The Senate debate Monday opened with more speeches by Helms and his associates aiming to hold up the deliberations.

Rowny Criticizes U.S. Senate on INF Treaty

LD2405091788 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] Washington May 25 TASS—Edward L. Rowny, special advisor to the President and secretary for arms control matters, criticised the position of some senators who try to delay consideration of the Soviet-U.S. intermediate nuclear forces treaty at the upper chamber of the U.S. Congress. Speaking in an interview of the Worldnet TV Network of the U.S. Information Agency, he said that the Senate was losing time and could delay ratification of the agreement because of technicalities which had nothing to do with the INF Treaty.

Rowny urged the Senate to give its consent to the ratification in time for Reagan's visit to Moscow. He highly appraised the INF Treaty which paved the way for future talks on arms control.

U.S. Preparing To Deploy Trident-2

LD2305163488 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] New York May 23 TASS—Intensive engineering construction work for deepening and broadening the fairway is underway at the Kings Bay Naval Base in Georgia. By the end of the year preparations are to be completed there for handling the nuclear-powered submarine Tennessee, in which intercontinental ballistic missiles Trident-2 are to be installed for the first time. The arrival of the Tennessee in Kings Bay will signal the start of an important stage in the programme for modernizing the U.S. strategic weapons, the COX NEWS SERVICE said.

More than eighteen hundred of the Pentagon's contractors have started the supply of components of missiles to the base even before the end of preparations in Kings Bay. This is done because unlike the other missile systems, Trident-2 will be assembled directly near the area, where the submarines will be based.

Trident-2, the most powerful strategic missile designed for the U.S. Navy, will be tipped with 10-12 warheads.

Demichev Meets With U.S. Leadership Group

LD2005141488 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—Petr Demichev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and first vice-president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received in the Kremlin today a delegation of the American Center for international leadership. The delegation is staying in the USSR at the invitation of the committee for Soviet youth organisations.

Petr Demichev stressed that dialogue between youth representatives of the two countries was evidence that their relations had rested on good traditions and the progressive development of those ties laid the groundwork for building trust and understanding between the Soviet Union and United States.

Having briefed the guests on main reforms in political, social, economic and other fields in the country, he noted that the involvement of ever new strata of Soviet society in the drive to transform all aspects of life was a guarantee of the irreversibility of those processes. The attention of the American representatives was drawn to the fact that the perestroyka drive in the Soviet Union had a great significance for bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States and the international situation on the whole.

The conversation also focused on Soviet-American dialogue. It was stressed that the forthcoming visit by the U.S. President was viewed in the Soviet Union and united states as an important stage in following up the results of the Washington meeting which marked the beginning of genuine destruction of nuclear arsenals.

It was confirmed that the Soviet leadership was ready to shift Soviet-American relations into the channel of cooperation to benefit the interests of our countries and the whole world. In this connection the delegation shared their considerations on the prospects and reserves for continuing along that road, stressing that the striving to strengthen and expand contacts with the Soviet Union in different areas had markedly increased in the United States recently.

Soviet-U.S. Youth Seminar Opens in Tbilisi

LD2305173288 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Tbilisi May 23 TASS—As the coming summit is drawing nearer, representatives of Soviet and American youth met in the capital of Georgia, a Soviet Trans-Caucasian Republic. A seminar of the committee of youth organizations of the USSR and the American Center for International Leadership opened here on Sunday.

In the framework of the seminar which continued today in Kobuleti, a Black Sea resort in the west of Georgia, work in groups proceeds on three main problems: disarmament, Soviet-American economic relations and humanitarian exchange.

"We hope that in open debates, candid exchange of opinion we shall be able to come to know each other better and understand different aspects of new political thinking," a TASS correspondent was told by Teimuraz Khvadadze, chairman of the Committee of Youth Organizations of Georgia.

Head of the U.S. delegation, Deputy Permanent Representative of the USA to the United Nations Daniel Nichols said that representatives of the Republican and Democratic Parties are on the U.S. delegation. He said that though they have some differences in views on some or other political problems, they are all united in the awareness of the need to prevent world war and strengthen peace on earth.

China

Zhao Meets Czechoslovakia's Jakes in Beijing

LD2305225288 Moscow TASS in English 2151 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Beijing May 23 TASS—China hopes that the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit will be marked by achievements in relaxing tensions in the world and reducing armaments, Zhao Ziyang, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, said today.

He was speaking at talks with Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, who has arrived in China on an official friendly visit.

"We welcome the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by the Soviet Union and the United States, and hold that common efforts by peoples of all countries are of much importance for further improvements in international relations," Zhao Ziyang said.

"At present, socialism in China is undergoing a process of self-knowledge. Over several decades of socialist development, we have accumulated vast positive experience but also had quite a few setbacks.

"Now we have understood more deeply that advantages of socialism were revealed in full measure only when we proceeded from real conditions in our country," the Chinese leader said.

Speaking about relations between the two parties and states, Zhao Ziyang emphasised that his party attached much importance to the development of relations in that sphere.

"There are many areas in which we cannot do without mutual understanding. Each side can borrow something from the other," he said.

The general secretary of the CCP Central Committee voiced the hope that Jakes's visit to China would promote deeper interaction between the two countries.

Jakes said that at today's talks the sides had found out that they were holding close, and in many respects fully identical, stands on key international problems.

"Today, Czechoslovakia is making efforts to make positive trends in international relations irreversible. We hope that the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow will make an important step in that direction," Jakes said.

"Czechoslovakia appreciates China's efforts for peace and against outer space militarisation, and shows sincere interest in deepening cooperation between the Communist parties of China and Czechoslovakia and in developing relations with China in all spheres of social life.

"We want such cooperation to be further developed," the general secretary of the CPC Central Committee said.

Alekseyev Views Afghanistan Pullout, Relations

OW2105065388 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 18 May 88

[Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] You must know that the Soviet Union began withdrawing its troops from Afghanistan on 15 May in accordance with the Geneva accords signed 1 month ago. The withdrawal will be completed in 9 months. In the initial 3 months, that is, before 15 August, half of the Soviet troops will return to their motherland. In this respect, station observer Alekseyev writes the following:

The Geneva accords begin to play their role. This, of course, is a very great event. Lately we often have heard people say that their significance is comparable to the INF Treaty signed between the Soviet Union and the United States in December 1987. Undoubtedly, as a matter of fact, it is so. I wish to add only one point: So far as we Soviets are concerned, the accords on Afghanistan have their particular, sentimental, and potential significance that cannot be matched by anything else on earth. Our youths fulfilling international obligations in Afghanistan are coming home at long last. Never before have we felt more acutely the suffering from our losses. The names of those who have bravely sacrificed themselves on Afghan soil will live in our memory forever.

During conversation with you about the international significance of the Geneva accords, I would like to touch on the issue of Soviet-Sino relations. I believe the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan will promote

further positive development of Soviet-Sino relations. This is not because the stationing of Soviet troops on Afghan soil has been a substantial obstacle to development of Soviet-Sino relations. As international experiences have convincingly proven, if two countries sincerely want good-neighborliness, co-existence, and cooperation, no third country can become a serious obstacle to this endeavor. Since the issue of stationing Soviet troops in Afghanistan has caused serious differences between our two countries, the fact that this issue is now eliminated from our agenda will no doubt play an active and beneficial role. We hope this situation will be conducive to an even better atmosphere when we discuss bilateral cooperation between the Soviet Union and China.

Incidentally, this kind of cooperation can also play an active role in promoting the sound development of the international situation. For instance, both the Soviet Union and China can do a lot of things regarding the settlement of the Cambodian issue. The main point is not that Moscow and Beijing have different views on the situation in Cambodia. Far more important is the fact that both the Soviet Union and China are convinced that this conflict can only be settled by peaceful political means. We shall never forget that it is this conviction cherished by all parties concerned that finally brought about the successful conclusion to the talk on Afghanistan's political situation.

Northeast Asia

PRAVDA Reports End of Biryukova DPRK Visit

PM2305145988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 88 First Edition p 6

[TASS report: "CPSU Delegation Returns"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 22 May—A CPSU delegation headed by CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.P. Biryukova was in the DPRK 16-21 May in line with the plan for ties between the CPSU and the Workers Party of Korea [WPK]. The delegation was received by Kim Il-song, general secretary of the WPK Central Committee and president of the DPRK. There were meetings and conversations with Yon Hyong-muk, member of the Politburo and secretary of the WPK Central Committee, and leading workers of a number of WPK Central Committee departments.

On 21 May the CPSU delegation left Pyongyang for home. It was seen off at the airport by Yon Hyong-muk, member of the Politburo and secretary of the WPK Central Committee, and other officials.

The delegation headed by A.P. Biryukova was greeted at the airport in Moscow by A.I. Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; L.F. Bobykin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Light Industry and Consumer Goods Department; M.N. Smirnovskiy, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee Department; other senior CPSU Central Committee oficials; and DPRK Ambassador to the USSR Kwon Hui-kyong.

All-Japan Seamen's Union Officials Interviewed

OW2005100788 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 May 88

[Excerpts] The other day, on their way back to Tokyo from Geneva, two officials of the All-Japan Seamen's Union came to the USSR for a few days' visit. Radio Moscow reporter (Sherenkov) met the two for an interview:

[Begin recording] [Osawa] I am Shuji Osawa, chief of the Fishing Boats Bureau of the All-Japan Seamen's Union.

[Nakao] I am Nakao of the International Department of the All-Japan Seamen's Union.

[(Sherenkov)] Please tell us the purpose of your coming to Moscow.

[Osawa] [Passage omitted] On our way from the Geneva ILO meeting, we came to Moscow to have discussions with the fishing labor union under the Seamen's Union of Moscow.

[(Sherenkov)] Please tell us about the exchanges between Soviet and Japanese fishing labor unions.

[Osawa] Exchanges between the fishing labor unions of Japan and the USSR have a history of almost 40 years. [passage omitted]

[(Sherenkov)] Mr. Osawa, tell us about the working conditions of the members of the All-Japan Seamen's Union and the orientation of your struggle.

[Osawa] [Passage omitted] Although the working conditions of Japanese seamen have improved year after year, we believe we must still strive for better working conditions for our seamen. [passage omitted]

[(Sherenkov)] Specifically, what have been the results of your struggle?

[Osawa] Although we had rough sailing during negotiations for this year's wage increase, we reached a settlement. [passage omitted]

Furthermore, as another specific problem, we would like to shorten the working hours of fishing boat workers. We would also like to ask the government to improve welfare for fishing boat workers. [passage omitted]

[(Sherenkov)] [Passage omitted] Politically, what are the activities of your union?

[Osawa] Politically, for one, we would like to work for peace, for a world with no war. Moreover, we would like to work for politics that serve the interest of the working people. [passage omitted]

[(Sherenkov)] [Passage omitted] Mr. Osawa, tell us your views on perestroyka.

[Osawa] [Passage omitted] The efforts the USSR exerts in seeking new reforms are highly commendable. [end recording]

Mr. Osawa was also asked about his opinions on the pullout of Soviet troops from Afghanistan starting 15 May:

[Begin Osawa recording] I greatly welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan. This is an important step toward peace among nations of the world. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Receives Vietnam's Nguyen Co Thach

PM2400123988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, met on 23 May with Nguyen Co Thach, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and foreign minister of Vietnam, who made a stopover in Moscow.

The meeting covered some pressing international matters and issues of consolidating interaction between the USSR and Vietnam on the international scene.

Eduard Shevardnadze and Nguyen Co Thach reaffirmed the unity of views of the USSR and the SRV on key contemporary problems and their desire to help in every way to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, strengthen general security and trust among the peoples, and establish new political thinking in international affairs. It was noted that the Nonaligned Movement—an influential political force of our age—is making a substantial contribution to the solution of pressing world problems.

The sides stressed the great importance of continuing Soviet-American dialogue to achieve a positive shift in the development of the international situation. The hope was expressed here that the upcoming Soviet-American summit in Moscow would impart a powerful new impetus to the process of nuclear disarmament, the basis of which was laid by the signing of the USSR-U.S Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

As they examined regional problems, the two foreign ministers paid special attention to the situation in Asia and the Pacific.

Nguyen Co Thach spoke highly of the USSR's constructive policy for an Afghanistan settlement and hailed the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and noted that their strict fulfillment by all interested parties will facilitate the successful implementation of the policy of national reconciliation and provide an incentive to solving other regional conflicts.

The Soviet expressed support for the efforts of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to improve the situation in Southeast Asia and settle all contentious issues in the region, including territorial disputes, by political means.

The Soviet Union and Vietnam are convinced that the path to resolving the Cambodian problem lies through dialogue between the opposing Cambodian sides in a spirit and on the basis of the principles of national reconciliation.

Note was taken in this connection of the constructive significance of the meetings between Norodom Sihanouk and Hun Sen, and the opinion was voiced that it is important for the intra-Cambodian dialogue to be further developed.

Eduard Shevardnadze reaffirmed the Soviet Union's readiness to contribute together with all interested sides to defusing the situation concerning Cambodia and fostering a situation of stability and cooperation in Southeast Asia.

Nguyen Co Thach informed the Soviet foreign minister of Vietnam's readiness to take part in a two-phase informal meeting in accordance with an understanding reached between Vietnam and Indonesia. The Soviet side expressed support for this position.

The meeting was held in an atmosphere of traditional friendship and complete mutual understanding.

Nguyen Co Thach left Moscow for Havana the same day.

Vietnamese Statement on Islands Dispute Noted

LD2305162588 Moscow TASS in English 1501 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Hanoi May 23 TASS—A spokesman for Vietnam's Foreign Ministry has made the following statement:

On May 12, 1988 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China issued a memorandum "On the Xisha and Nansha Archipelagoes" (in other words the Vietnamese archipelagoes Truong Sa and Hoang Sa) which said: "China is coming invariably in favour of a

peaceful settlement of disputes among nations, including the one concerning the Nansha Islands. China has temporarily put aside this issue in order to resolve it through negotiations in future."

Vietnam's position with regard to these archipelagoes is clear and there is no need to remind it. The Vietnamese side has taken into consideration China's point of view: That is to put off temporarily the solution of the Truong Sa Islands issue in order to solve it later by way of negotiations. This is in line with Vietnam's invariable stance that all differences and issues between Vietnam and China, including those over the Hoang Sa and Truong Sa Islands and the land border, should be settled through negotiations.

Pending the beginning of the talks, the two sides should refrain from any clashes to prevent the aggravation of the situation.

Deputy Premier Tolstykh Sees Off Thailand's Prem

PM2305150188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 88 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Leaving the USSR"]

[Text] Leningrad, 22 May—Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon left the USSR today. He had been paying an official visit to our country at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

He was seen off at the aiport by USSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman B.L. Tolstykh and other officials and also by Thai Ambassador to the USSR Prachit Rotchanaphruk.

New Zealand Parliamentarians Continue Tour

Visit Georgia

LD2305163588 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Tbilisi May 23 TASS—The delegation of New Zealand's Parliament led by Parliament Speaker Thomas Burke, currently visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, have for three days familiarized themselves with life in Georgia, a Soviet Transcaucasian republic. The guests visited the museum city of Mtskheta, the ancient capital of Georgia, where they saw monuments of culture of the fourth-sixth centuries.

At a meeting with Pavel Gilashvili, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Georgia, the New Zealand MPs were briefed on the course of implementation of the programme for accelerating economic and social development in the republic.

The members of the delegation showed much interest in the development of public education in Georgia, where at schools with a total enrollment of a million of schoolchildren, instruction is done in the Georgian, Russian, Armenian, Azerbaijanian, Abkhazian, Ossetic and Greek languages.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian SSR gave a dinner in honour of the New Zeland MPs.

The delegation left by air today for Leningrad, where they will continue familiarising themselves with the Soviet land.

Arrive in Leningrad

LD2305225988 Moscow TASS in English 2102 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Leningrad May 23 TASS—The delegation of New Zealand's Parliament, now touring the Soviet Union, arrived in Leningrad from Tbilisi, Georgia's capital, today. The delegation is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On their way from the airport the guests made a stopover at the monument in memory of the defenders of the city in the years of the Second World War. The Leningraders were fighting during 900 days and nights in Nazi blockade conditions. Over a million soldiers and citizens gave their lives to bring about victory over the enemy. The fascists were unable to occupy Leningrad.

The parliamentarians paid tribute to the memory of the fallen and laid red carnations to the monument.

Message Sent to Western Samoan Prime Minister

PM2305134188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 May 88 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has sent Tupuola Efi, prime minister of Western Samoa, a telegram conveying congratulations and wishes for success in connection with his appointment to that high post.

In a reply telegram T. Efi expressed gratitude for the congratulations and good wishes.

Both sides were of the opinion that relations between the two countries must continue developing in the spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation, in the interests of strengthening peace and international security.

Near East & South Asia

No Civilians Killed in Kabul Rocket Attack

LD2305162688 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 23 TASS—Intransigent opposition elements today committed another crime by subjecting one of the areas in the Afghan capital to a rocket attack.

As a result of that barbarous action, the building of the Bute Aho shoes factory suffered damage.

No civilians were reported killed or injured.

'Extremists' Shell Villages

LD2105142688 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Kabul may 21 TASS—Afghan extremists shelled from heavy weapons villages in Sarkoni District, Kunar Province, BAKHTAR news agency reported.

Two children were killed and five adults wounded in that barbarous action which also inflicted much damage to peasants' houses.

Further on Attacks

LD2405084188 Moscow TASS in English 0756 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 24 TASS—A total of 1,350 people have returned from abroad to the Afghan provinces of Helmand, Nangarhar and Badghis over the past few days.

The former refugees, who came back after several years in Iran and Pakistan, were provided with aid, including free food, shoes, clothes and other prime necessities, by Afghan authorities.

Security forces have been able to prevent a rocket attack on Jalalabad, administrative center of Nangarhar Province, after being tipped off by local people about 29 rockets set up for launch outside the city.

In Qandahar Province, Afghan troops have smashed another extremist group which has repeatedly fired rockets on populated localities. Several extremists, including the group leader, were killed during the operation, Bakhtar News Agency reported.

In Qarah Bagh District of the province of Ghazni, there has been an armed clash between rival opposition groups and several persons are reported to have been killed.

Several rockets exploded in residential areas in Kabul in the morning today. No reports about casualties and destruction have come in yet.

Najibullah Interviewed on Future Government

LD2205064488 Moscow TASS in English 0636 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] New Delhi May 22 TASS—The Government of Afghanistan has the capacity to defend its country if outside interference in the Republic's affairs is ceased, Najibullah, president of Afghanistan, said in an interview with Indian journalists.

The president expressed confidence that all moderate forces would take part in the country's coalition government, the newspaper INDIAN EXPRESS reports.

Najibullah stressed that the Afghan Government is firmly committed to the fulfillment of the Geneva agreements. At the same time, Afghanistan's concern over the violations of these agreements was brought to the knowledge of U.S. representatives, he noted. If the United States goes ahead with weapons shipments to the extremists, the international guarantees on the part of the United States will become empty words.

Najibullah stated that the national reconciliation policy pursued by the Afghan Government enjoys broad support both inside the country and among the Afghan refugees. The national reconciliation process is irreversible, he stressed.

Touching on the issue of the future government of Afghanistan, the president noted that the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan is ready to share power with other partners in the coalition on the basis of the political and programme compromises that would meet the country's national interests.

TV Shows Troops' Complete Nangarhar Pullout

LD2305181788 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 23 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Nangarhar Province has been completed.

[Begin recording] [M. Leshchinskiy] Soviet motor rifle units and subunits are on the move on the roads of Afghanistan every day. They are moving northward, toward our state border. They are moving precisely according to schedule. There have been no losses of men or equipment. Safety of the traffic is provided at mobile guard posts and road blocks.

It is our servicemen who are performing this service; they still have some time to go before returning home. They take the firing of the rebels who are trying to cut the road and to fire rocket missiles and firearms point blank at our convoys.

[Lieutenant-Colonel V.N. Denisov, identified by caption] Today the last colum has gone from Jalalabad toward Kabul. Over the course of 12 days, our division is covering the movement of Soviet columns from Jalalabad toward Kabul. The division has successfully fulfilled its combat task.

[Leshchinskiy] Tell me, what evidence has there been of the armed opposition in that time?

[Denisov] In that time, the armed opposition, despite the fact that there exist matters connected with the ceasefire, has however been acting against our guard posts and our subunits blocking this road. In the course of this time, the enemy has used surface-to-surface missiles, about 200 of which have been fired at us.

[Leshchinskiy] Have they fired mortars as well?

[Denisov] There has also been mortar fire, with the armed opposition trying to inflict damage on the columns which were passing from Jalalabad to Kabul.

[Colonel N.M. Vasilyev, identified by caption] I must say that our soldiers, junior officers, and officers, diplaying exceptional personal courage and a profound understanding of the task they are carrying out, have not left the field of combat; not one of them. I ought to cite names such as (Nikolay Senchenkov) who was wounded, and (Misha Myagkov), and a number of other lads, such as Lance Corporal (Kiselenko) and Private (Shchelek). Even though they had been wounded, they said to their commanders: Leave us; we must stay here in the battlefield to the end. These lads are simply priceless.

[Leshchinskiy] Well, thank you, I know that the division's combat tasks do not end with this; you will have to be among the last to leave Afghanistan. I wish you and your men success. [end recording]

Bovin Describes 'Bitter Joy' on Troops' Return

LD2205201788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1358 GMT 22 May 88

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. We probably all understand and feel that the main, the most important event of the week is the beginning of the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan. The Soviet leadership made the difficult decision, but the only correct decision—correct from both the political and the moral points of view—to withdraw from this war. We are welcoming with joy those who have been fighting courageously in Afghanistan, who have been honorably fulfilling their military duty. But our joy is bitter: More than 13,000 people have died, more than 30,000 have been wounded, there are many invalids. It is hard to speak of this, but we must. It is essential that we should speak. We shall have to speak about it for a long time to come. Speak to draw the lessons from what happened.

Let us think about it together. The first lesson, I think, a lesson of principle is this: It was formulated by Friedrich Engels more than 100 years ago. He spoke of how the victorious proletariat cannot make other peoples happy by force. We quoted these words, referred to them, but unfortunately in real politics there is a great temptation to go beyond the framework of some sort of abstract positions, the framework of principles. But unfortunately this always exacts a cruel revenge.

The second lesson is also one of principle: It is essential to improve our legislation. The sending of Soviet Armed Forces abroad to take part in combat activities can only be done after discussion in the highest legislative organs of the country, and it must be with their agreement. This is one of the essential signs of a state of law which we want to create.

It is possible that my conclusions are limited. It is possible that there are other lessons here, too. But the main thing is that we all need to think about this, discuss this problem, in order for the same thing not to happen again.

Now another question which interests us all. What is going to happen in Afghanistan? It is hard if not impossible to answer this question unambiguously. The best alternative is national reconciliation, the creation of a coalition government on a broad social base. But the leaders of the mujahidin [mujakhed], at least the majority of them, are aiming at the total removal of the current government, and as a consequence a civil war, a war with an indeterminate result, will evidently continue. It is not impossible that clashes will also start within the mujahidin themselves, since they depend on different tribes and control different territory. They have different ideas about the future of their country. For now they are united by the fact that they are fighting Soviet troops, but when we leave, evidently relations between them will worsen, most likely.

But so far the mujahidin are continuing their military activities and evidently are preparing for a decisive attack. Since Pakistan took upon itself the obligation not to allow the mujahidin to act on its territory, there was a feverish transfer of bases on the eve of 15 May, moving field stores of arms and ammunitions from Pakistan to the territory of Afghanistan. I think that in one form or another they will go on supporting the mujahidin there in spite of the Geneva agreements. And the content of the so-called American guarantees is too vague.

In general, comrades, the situation in Afghanistan remains complicated, confused, and contradictory, as I see it. And it will remain so for a long time to come.

Costs, Benefits of Afghan Presence Weighed
PM2405121588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 May 88 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Lyudmila Shchipakhina under the "Writer's Word" rubric: "Motherland Is Welcoming Its Sons"]

[Text] Now that our internationalist servicemen who have honorably and courageously fulfilled their martial duty are returning home from Afghanistan, it is time to think, time to sum up the results of their presence on Afghan soil. Of course, there have been such thoughts before. But now there are special reasons and grounds for them.

I had the chance to visit Afghanistan and to meet with our soldiers and officers there. I also visited Jalalabad, from which our subunits had returned. I saw the transformations in the country, the changes in Afghans' awareness and mentality under the influence of the April revolution. Of course there were also many problems and unresolved questions. And now our soldiers, invited by the country's lawful government to defend the revolution, are returning home.

How have they helped Afghanistan, what have they accomplished? On the basis of my observations the significance of the stay of our limited contingent in the Republic of Afghanistan cannot be assessed by the usual concepts of military victories and defeats. I will note that the social bridgeheads which the government of the popular-democratic Afghanistan occupied have perhaps not been expanded and definitively reinforced. And here I should like to speak of the main thing. After all, there are values which cannot be measured by strictly military statistics. They include, first, reliable confidence in your neighbor, in your friend. Second, there is the selfless transfer of moral experience, military knowledge, and skills by our servicemen to the soldiers and officers of the friendly army. There is the boldness, courage, and sacrifice of our sons for all to see.

We often discuss the younger generation. Our soldiers in Afghanistan have displayed the best features of this generation, becoming the heirs to and continuers of the martial glory of their fathers, the soldiers of the Great Patriotic War. They have once more shown the whole world the valor and lofty moral qualities of a soldier of the Land of the Soviets. Passing through difficulties, through trial in battle, the young boys became a powerful and reliable reserve for today's transformations in our country.

Everyone knows that modern means of warfare are unusually complex and require all-around knowledge and special abilities and skills. Our boys, stepping onto the land of friendly Afghanistan, showed their confident mastery of complex combat equipment. They had a sufficient baggage of knowledge and persistence to learn what was needed there under extreme conditions of battle. This ability is also a characteristic feature of young people today.

Now I shall speak of personal courage. Where except in Afghanistan has it been manifested so graphically, so visibly! Soldiers saved their commanders at the cost of their lives, waged unequal battles in the mountains, embarked on risky operations, broke out of encirclement, displaying the wisdom and bravery of fighters. Many of the exploits accomplished in those years have been described in the press and many servicemen have been awarded lofty state orders. Genuine friendship, a sense of comradeship, mutual assistance, unity—everything which we constantly urge our young people to display was manifested in Afghanistan. The words "friend" and "comrade" regained their real meaning. It is no accident that on returning to the motherland the "Afghans," as we call the boys who fought there, are drawn to each other, seek each other out, correspond with each other, pass on their experience to young men of predraft age, devote themselves to good, creative deeds, and take an active and bold part in our restructuring. So Afghanistan revealed much of what had been instilled in our sons by their entire preceding education.

How wisely and nobly the Afghan Government acted in instituting the medal "To an internationalist serviceman from the grateful Afghan people." It seems to me that our boys who have passed through the ordeal of war should also be given a Soviet award. I am speaking specifically of a medal, of a state award for those who took part in the fighting in Afghanistan and perhaps in general for internationalist servicemen and not simply some commemorative badge.

But we cannot fail to remember too the bitter, agonizing, tragic aspect, to remember how many young lives were given to this struggle, how many sons did not return home. It must be said honestly that the cause of the Afghan revolution has not yet been seen through to the end. That is our second source of pain, because sacrifices should have some point and result.

I often think nowadays of how matters will proceed in the future on Afghan soil. I remember my meeting with a women's armed detachment in the hamlet of Mesrabad. Despite all the prescriptions of Islam, the women there had taken up arms and organized a detachment to defend the revolution. They guarded their land against the gangs' attacks. Where were the men of this hamlet? Some were serving in the Army and were also fighting, some had died in the fighting, some had left for the mountains. It is in woman's nature to be the guardian of the home, a creator. With their sensitive hearts the women of Mesrabad had understood that you have to struggle for a peaceful day.

The women's armed detachment was headed by 40-year-old Nazir Khol [name as published], the mother of four children. I think now of her destiny and the destiny of her detachment. Will they hold out? If the situation changes will these women of the East be forgiven for their unprecedented "audacity?" What will happen to their children and the hamlet?..

But my anguish and concern are not only for them. I remember many, many Afghans, honest and brave Afghans who had wholeheartedly accepted the ideals of the April revolution. There have been many exploits in their destiny, they are prepared to fight to the end for an idea. But what kind of end will it be? This worries me, perturbs me, gives me no rest.

Over these years we have grown accustomed to being with the Afghans, to taking their successes and defeats, thoughts and deeds to our hearts. We did indeed live as brothers. Our brotherhood is not ending. The new stage entails a new situation. I think about whether anyone is to blame for everything which has happened in Afghanistan and which has affected us so painfully. Our conscience as Communists would never have allowed us not to respond to the call of a revolutionary government. Our peace policy and our friendly relations with the fraternal countries also obliged us to respond to the call for help. But the real conditions of aid and the internal situation in Afghanistan proved far more complex than this broad and friendly impulse. I think that the Afghan comrades, the fighters for the April revolution at its various levels, have not done everything possible to exert subtle and balanced influence on people's consciousness, attracting them to their side. In some places and in some respects the ideas of the April revolution have not reached the consciousness of a people of many tribes, a society of many strata. The frenzied fanaticism of the opponents of the revolution and the traditions of inflexibility and bellicosity inherent in the Afghans were not considered.

I met with one of the leaders of a detachment of rebels who had gone over to the side of the revolution. His name was Malang [name as published]. He had led his armed detachment into the valley and laid down his arms. He asked to redeem his errors by fighting in the ranks of the Afghan army. The government displayed humanity and the detachment joined a military unit. I asked Malang what had prompted him to go over to the side of the revolution. His reply was surprisingly simple: "I was tired of war. I want to feel that I am a man." And he immediately added: "I want to get married and live peacefully."

The desire for a peaceful life is obviously inherent in every person and in Afghanistan it can be felt particularly acutely in these difficult years. But the peaceful life has been constantly violated by those who have shipped weapons along the secret paths of the Hindu Kush, supplied arms, and worked out the strategy and tactics of the rebels' operations. Surely all this could not lead to peace? The skillfully and cunningly aroused opposition in the country, the acts of subversion against the civilian population, the destabilization of the situation in the republic—these were all far from spontaneous actions, they were a precise, regulated plan of action encouraged and supported by the ruling circles of a number of well known states.

Yes, our servicemen are leaving Afghanistan. We hope that the principled positions coordinated in Geneva will be reinforced by real deeds by all the sides which took part in this difficult process. Our hope lies in the reasonableness of the political decisions and strategic actions of the present Afghan Government. Afghanistan will be the way the Afghans themselves want to see it. The people must choose their path of development for themselves. We will continue to think of them, to remember them and to expect news. Time will not sunder the threads linking our hearts or cool our souls. We know that in the south of our state there is a border on the other side of which live bold, wise, noble people, the possessors of an ancient culture and unforgettable folk traditions. May all that is best and kindest accompany their destiny.

Vavilov on 'Violation' of Geneva Accords

LD2005184688 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Deputy to U.N. Secretary-General's Representative General Raul Helminen left Kabul for Islamabad. Hardly a few days passed since the coming into effect of the Geneva accords on the political settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan than the interference of the head of the group of the U.N. observers in Afghanistan and Pakistan, controlling the observance of the provisions of the Geneva accords, has been required: The Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan referred to the U.N. mission a second official note which states that the Pakistani side departs from the Geneva accords.

What is the point of the matter? It is absolutely clear that a difficult process of peaceful settlement requires most thorough unswerving observance of all the terms of the agreement, a most responsible approach of all parties to the Geneva accords to their implementation. And any deviations, any "free" and "broad" interpretations of separate articles and clauses of the accords are intolerable.

There is, for instance, Clause 12 in the bilateral agreement, which clearly and definitely prohibits the rendering of any assistance to groups acting against Afghanistan, ..." for the purpose of creating subversion, disorder or unrest in the territory" of Afghanistan. This clause, likewise, prohibits "the transportation of arms, ammunition and equipment by such individuals and groups".

Pakistan's Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Zain Noorani, is a signatory to this agreement. During his recent visit to Moscow he made assurances that Islamabad intends to unswervingly observe the commitments not to interfere in Afghanistan's internal affairs, that Pakistan would not like its territory to be used for the delivery of armaments meant for hostile actions against the neighbouring country.

This is what documents say, this is what the Pakistani minister says. And what happens in reality? The unprecedented amounts of armaments, ammunition and various military equipment stream to borderline areas of Pakistan where camps of armed units of the Afghan opposition are situated. This is reported by the U.S. newspaper "CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR". The newspaper writes that more than 40 trucks with heavy mortars, rocketry complexes, firearms, ammunition, are sent daily to Paktia Province for units of mujahids. Large volumes of armaments, up to 80-100 trucks a day, are also carried on other stretches of Pakistani-Afghan border.

Is this not an outright violation of the Geneva accords? Upon the return from Moscow, the Pakistani minister confirmed that Pakistan will continue giving assistance to the United States in arming Afghan military units. So, the Pakistani minister said one thing in Moscow, and says another in Islamabad. Supporting the armed opposition, the Pakistani minister declares that "mujahids are in the lead of the struggle of the Afghan people, that their struggle is legal and their triumph is inevitable".

These pronouncements can only be assessed as an outright instigation of the forces hostile to Kabul to the intensification of the struggle against the lawful government, as a direct interference in the internal affairs of a neighbouring state, whose people will be able to decide without Islamabad's prompting what kind of government it needs. The policy of national reconciliation, the invitation of Kabul to all the opposition groups to take part in such a coalition government has long since been made in Kabul and it was made many times.

Will it not be better for Islamabad not to interfere in the affairs of the neighbouring state, but to observe unswervingly the Geneva accords?

Pakistan Urged To Prohibit Arms Traffic

LD2005152388 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—The Afghan Foreign Ministry Thursday handed the group of U.N. monitors in Kabul an official note over the Pakistani side's departure from the Geneva agreements.

An IZVESTIYA correspondent was told the following at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate in this connection:

The shipping of arms and ammunition from Pakistan into the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan is an obvious violation of the Geneva agreements which entered into force on May 5.

Such actions by the Pakistani side contradict the obligations stemming from the bilateral agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan on the principles of mutual relations, in particular on non-interference and non-intervention.

As applied specifically to Pakistan, these commitments mean that it should discontinue the entire range of actions and activities to interfere in the affairs of Afghanistan.

In particular, it should refrain from making its territory available for hostile actions against the other side, from any form of intervention and any act of military, political or economic interference and from the promotion, encouragement or support of rebellious or secessionist activities, and prevent the training, equipping, financing and recruitment of mercenaries in its territory.

In accordance with the spirit and letter of this agreement, Pakistan should not pass on to anti-government groups any arms and hardware of any origin.

As a guarantor of the Afghan-Pakistani agreement, the Soviet union proceeds from the premise that the commitments made by Pakistan under this bilateral agreement, including the obligation not to convey any arms and hardware to the opposition, should be meticulously honored and fulfilled by Pakistan.

The Geneva agreements have just become effective. Soviet troops have begun to be withdrawn from Afghanistan. The Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan are fulfilling their obligations under the Geneva agreements and urge Pakistan to do so as well.

Noorani Announces Joint Commission Plans

LD2005123088 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] The Soviet Union and Pakistan have agreed to set up a joint government commission. The Pakistani minister of state of foreign affairs, Zain Noorani, has announced in Islamabad that details of the commission will be soon settled. Commenting on his recent visit to Moscow, Mr Noorani noted his useful talks with the Soviet leaders. The Soviet Union, he said, is greatly interested in developing trade and economic cooperation with Pakistan.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani on 'State of War' With U.S.

PM2405103588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Undated dispatch by own correspondent V. Shevchenko: "Persian Gulf; One More Squadron"]

[Text] Kuwait—Six new U.S. warships have arrived in the Persian Gulf region. They include the attack aircraft carrier "Forrestal" which provides air cover for the U.S. fleet.

Washington's line toward building up its military presence in the Gulf is fraught with the danger of adverse consequences for the countries of the region, the local press notes.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Iranian parliament, has stated that Iran officially considers itself in a state of war with the United States. Tehran radio has reported that in the Strait of Hormuz Iran has embarked on maneuvers codenamed "Zolfaqar" in which over 50 warships and high-speed launches and aircraft and airborne subunits are taking part.

Ryzhkov Condemns Chemical Weapon Use

LD2105195088 Tehran IRNA in English 1828 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Tehran, May 21, IRNA—The Soviet Union's Chairman of the Council of Ministers Nikolay I. Ryzhkov in a message to Prime Minister Hoseyn Musavi Saturday condemned the use of chemical weapons termint it "a dangerous and savage act."

The message in response to Musavi's message on the Iraqi regime's deployment of chemical arms stresses that the use of such lethal arms is unjustifiable and against the very values of civilization and humanity. The Soviet official also denounced the deployment of any kind of chemical substances in war.

The repeated use of this anti-human weapon and the resultant massacre of innocent people confirms once more, the need for an effective international convention prohibiting the procurement, production, and storage of toxic arms and their eventual destruction, said Ryzhkov's message.

He concluded by pointing to the fact that extensive deployment of chemical weapons in the course of the Iraq-Iran war has made Moscow concerned.

Further 'Abd Al-Majid Activities in Moscow

Receives Message for Mubarak

NC2005190588 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1818 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 20 May (MENA)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has given Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, a message of friendship for President Husni Mubarak in reply to Mubarak's message which he received from Dr 'Abd al-Majid at noon today.

'Abd al-Majid stated that his meeting with Soviet leader Gorbachev was successful and friendly, reflecting the amity that links the Egyptian and Soviet peoples.

Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze has described the meeting between Gorbachev and 'Abd al-Majid as deep, detailed, and very important. He noted that during the meeting all issues concerning the tywo countries were discussed with full cordiality and frankness.

Soviet sources stated that the alteration to the program of 'Abd al-Majid's Moscow visit, which enabled him to meet with Gorbachev before the first session of official talks, is unprecedented. The meeting, which was scheduled for 1 hour, lasted 1 and 1/2 hours. Gorbachev eagerly came to the entrance of the reception hall to welcome 'Abd al-Majid. The Soviet leaders allowed Egyptian journalists to enter the Kremlin and attend the initial meeting between Dr 'Abd al-Majid and the Soviet leader. This has never happened before and it has set a precedent. Gorbachev told the reporters: I hope your stay in Moscow will be pleasant. He asked them about the weather. The meeting between Gorbachev and 'Abd al-Majid was characterized by visible friendliness.

Holds News Conference

NC2105162988 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1550 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 21 May (MENA)—Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, Egyptian deputy prime minister and foreign minister, stated today that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has accepted an invitation to visit Egypt, indicating that the date will be set later.

During a news conference held at the conclusion of his visit to Moscow, Dr 'Abd al-Majid disclosed that Cairo will be the venue of the first meeting of the joint Egyptian-Soviet Committee, which will convene before the end of this summer. The committee had been formed under the economic and trade agreement between the two countries. In this connection, Dr 'Abd al-Majid affirmed that Egypt welcomes the establishment of joint projects with the USSR.

Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid had held a meeting earlier today with accredited Arab ambassadors in the Soviet capital. During the meeting, he had briefed them on the results of

his talks with Soviet officials during his 3-day official visit. He also had briefed them on Egyptian policy regarding all Arab and international issues. The meeting fell within the framework of the continuing coordination and consultation between Egypt and its Arab brothers.

Further on Comments

JN2305182988 Cairo AL-AKHBAR in Arabic 22 May 88 p 9

[By Muhammad Barakat]

[Text] Moscow—At a news conference in Moscow yesterday evening before his return to Cairo, Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid [Egyptian deputy prime minister and minister of state for foreign affairs], stated that discussions dealt with all matters pertaining to bilateral relations as well as regional and international problems. He added that the visit was successful and fruitful. He said that Egypt and the USSR concluded an economic trade, cultural, scientific, and technical cooperation agreement. He added that this agreement is a comprehensive framework for promoting relations in all fields.

He said that a joint ministerial committee was formed between the two countries that will alternately meet in Cairo and Moscow. He said that Egypt invited the Soviet side to hold the first meeting of this committee in Cairo in the near future to discuss all the details pertaining to the agreement.

On the political side, Dr 'Abd al-Majid said that he invited Eduard Shevardnadze to visit Egypt, and that the Soviet foreign minister accepted the invitation. The date will be set through diplomatic channels. Dr 'Abd al-Majid said that Egypt values the Soviet Union's policy and its current trends and that the Soviet Union also values Egypt's policy and trends.

Dr 'Abd al-Majid emphasized that Egypt and the USSR are opening a new page in their relations, which are based on mutual respect. He said that the two countries can cooperate in important fields and are eager to develop cooperation and relations in all fields. He added that his visit to the USSR, his important talks with Gorbachev and the foreign minister, and the conclusion of the agreement will have a great impact on the two countries relations. He said that the results of the talks will contribute to the attainment of peace, stability, and development in a region that is experiencing a major conflict.

At the news conference, which was attended by Arab, Soviet, and Egyptian journalists, Dr 'Abd al-Majid said that Egypt views the current Soviet policy as realistic and objective, that the Soviets have demonstrated a desire to solve regional problems, and that this conforms to Egyptian policy, which seeks just peace, stability, and the development of Egypt's resources in the interests of the Egyptian people and the people in the region. He added that cooperation with the Soviet Union stems from these bases because the Soviets under Gorbachev also seek to develop their resources and achieve stability to benefit their people. He said that his visit to the USSR was short but had been a very constructive and fruitful. He said that current Soviet policy in the Middle East is realistic and seeks to achieve a balance among the interests of all the parties in the region, that is Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Israel. He said that Egypt completely agrees with this realistic Soviet policy.

Dr 'Abd al-Majid then spoke about the trade between Egypt and the USSR. He said that the agreement is a comprehensive framework for bolstering economic and trade relations as well as scientific and technical cooperation. He said that current trade between the two countries amounts to 790 million accounting pounds, 590 million representing the volume of the trade and 20 million accounting pounds as deals. This equal 1.85 billion Egyptian pounds.

Dr 'Abd al-Majid said that the new agreement will allow the USSR to implement projects included in the Egyptian 5-year plan on the basis of developing existing industries, participating in new industries, or modernizing and introducing technology into some existing industries such as iron, steel, aluminium and others. He added that oportunities also exist for the USSR to implement electricity projects in Egypt, particularly the coal-fired electricity plant in Sinai. All this will be studied and implemented by the two sides through the joint ministerial committee that was established. He said that two subcommittees will stem from this joint committee to study and implement projects.

He said that Egypt will pay for the USSR technical and technological participation through the export of Egyptian products to the Soviet Union, which means a great improvement with respect to Egyptian exports to the Soviet market.

Dr 'Abd al-Majid also said that the agreement allows the Egyptian and Soviet sides to carry out joint ventures throught the private sector in Egypt and the private institutions in the USSR in light of Soviet glasnost. He said that there are many ivnestment projects in Egypt, and that Egypt welcomes Soviet participation in these projects at suitable and competitive prices.

Signs Protocol

NC2005163288 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1450 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 20 May (MENA)—The Arab Republic of Egypt and the Soviet Union signed an economic, commercial, technical, and scientific cooperation protocol this evening. Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, signed for Egypt, while Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze signed on behalf of the Soviet Union.

The protocol reflects the historic ties linking Egypt and the Soviet Union. It aims to enhance the scope of cooperation, promote equal-share transactions, and increase the volume of bilateral trade. It also provides for dealings between various companies in both countries, including those in the private sector.

Under the terms of the protocol, a joint intergovernmental committee will be set up, with two subcommittees: one to deal with trade matters, and another to handle economic and technical cooperation. The joint committee's task will be to follow up and facilitate the implementation of agreements concluded between the two countries under the protocol.

According to the protocol, projects for which feasibility studies have been concluded will be implemented. Prominent among these projects is the expansion and modernization of the Hulwan iron and steel factory, the productivity of which will rise to 1 1/2 million tons, in contrast to the present 850,000 tons. Other projects include the completion of the aluminum complex and the modernization of thermal plants, alloy factories, the Abu Tartur phosphate factory in al-Wadi al-Jadid, and the Alexandria shipyard.

Where trade is concerned, the protocol provides for an increase in Egyptian exports, the revenues from which will be used to service Egypt's debts to the Soviet Union. In addition to traditional exports, such as raw cotton and cotton thread, new exports will be introduced, including carpets, furniture, ready-made clothing, leathergoods, and fruits.

Departs Moscow

LD2105224688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, has left the Soviet Union. He was in our country at the invitation of the Soviet Government for an official visit. At the airport in Moscow he was seen off by Comrade Shevardnadze and other officials. Among the escort party were Basyuni, the Egyptian ambassador to the USSR, and the heads of a number of Arab states' diplomatic missions accredited in the USSR.

Vedernikov at Departure

NC2105164888 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1625 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 21 May (MENA)—Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, left Moscow for Cairo this evening following the conclusion of an official 3-day visit to the USSR.

Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid was seen off at the airport by Gennediy Vedernikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Yuliy Vorontsov, first deputy Soviet foreign minister; Salah Basyuni, Egyptian ambassador to Moscow; a number of accredited Arab ambassadors to the USSR; and Egyptian Embassy staff members.

'Abd al-Majid on Visit

LD2105203088 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Ladies and gentlemen, the official visit to Moscow by Dr. Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, Egyptian deputy prime minister and foreign minister, ended on 21 May. He was received by Mikhail Gorbachev. He had talks with Eduard Shevardnadze and other Soviet officials.

Mr. Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid made a statement to our correspondent, Aleksandr Timoshkin, before leaving for his country:

[Begin recording] ['Abd al-Majid] The impression I would like to convey is that I am satisfied with regard to all parts of the visit. The visit, of course, came at the invitation of Mr Shevardnadze, the Soviet foreign minister. It was a good coincidence that the visit took place during this time. The meetings I had, first of all with Comrade Gorbachev, and then with a number of Soviet officials, at their forefront Mr Shevardnadze, were fruitful, interesting, and important. I was left with an excellent impression. The talks were characterized by frankness, realism, objectivity, and seriousnsss.

In fact, these are characteristics of Soviet foreign policy during the period in which Comrade Gorbachev took control of the leadership of this friendly country. We have read and heard all about this, but reality the person one sees is not like the person one hears about. I have had the opportunity to see for myself. This is my first visit to the Soviet Union. I have had occasion to talk about common issues, the bilateral matters that concern both countries, and regional and international issues. I was entrusted to convey a message form His Excellency President Husni Mubarak to Mr Mikhail Gorbachev. God willing, when I return to my country today, I will submit a report on this visit to His Excellency Husni Mubarak.

[Timoshkin] Can you give us some details about the agreements that were signed during Your Excellency's visit?

['Abd al-Majid] An agreement was signed yesterday with Mr Shevardnadze. It includes an economic cooperation and trade exchange agreement and cooperation agreements in the cultural and scientific and technical fields. This agreement, in fact, is a framework that includes all the fields I mentioned. We decided to set up a joint committee which will meet alternatively in Cairo and

Moscow, and we have invited the Soviet delegation to attend the first session of the committee in Cairo at the nearest opportunity so it can discuss all the matters in the agreement.

[Timoshkin] Naturally, Deputy Prime Minister, we are aware that relations between the Soviet Union and Egypt were not always good. What are the prospects for developing our relations at present and in the future?

['Abd al-Majid] I would like to answer you very honestly and say that in our present policy we are looking to the future. If we look to the past, each side has to learn the lessons of the past so past mistakes are not repeated.

This enables us to say that we are today at a new page, which we are opening with the Soviet Union. Each side has consideration for the other. Egypt appreciates the present Soviet policy, and we are talking today within its framework. My feeling is that the Soviet Union appreciates Egyptian policy and its pillars.

This is a field and I mentioned, seconds ago, some of the important fields between us and the Soviet Union. [sentence as heard] Egypt is keen and the Soviet Union is keen on reinforcing cooperation in these fields, and I believe that the high level meetings that took place during this visit and the signing of such a significant agreement satisfy both sides and could realize the interests of both sides, reflected by their desire to attain peace, stability, and development in a region that is experiencing acute conflicts.

We see a realistic and objective view in the Soviet Union's policy and a desire to settle regional problems. The Soviet Union can contribute toward realizing these objectives, which are at the same time Egypt's objectives. We want just and honorable peace. We want stability in our country and in our region. We want to develop our resources. From what I have seen in this country, where we are today, they aim toward the same objectives. If I may talk about Soviet domestic policy and the developments taking place, I would say that no doubt it is a policy that aims at developing the country's resources, and they are huge resources, and at explaining what is in the interest of Soviet citizens, not more conflict or war. This could be the wisdom or the lessons we deduce from a visit that did not last more than 2 days. However, I believe it was rich and eventful, be it in regard to our bilateral relations or in regard to regional and international stands and problems. [end recording]

Talks Herald 'New Stage'

NC2005212688 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2050 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 20 May (MENA)—The talks between Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze ended this evening. 'Abd al-Majid described the discussions, which were concerned with bilateral and international issues, as constructive and said that they were held in an atmosphere of friendship and understanding. He asserted that the agreement signed between the two countries today heralds the beginning of a new stage in relations between Egypt and the Soviet Union. He noted that the formation of a joint committee will greatly boost bilateral ties and contribute toward the operation, refurbishment, and expansion of the industrial projects that were previously established with Soviet help. These projects constitute the principal bases of Egyptian industry, he said.

'Abd al-Majid is scheduled to leave Moscow tomorrow, Saturday, for Cairo, concluding a 3-day visit to the Soviet Union. He will submit a detailed report to President Mubarak on the outcome of his talks with Soviet officials.

India Struggles With Sikh 'Terrorism'

PM2005142788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 88 Second Edition p 7

[Oleg Kitsenko "Viewpoint": "Attack on Terrorism"]

[Text] The events of recent days which have unfolded around the Sikh sacred shrine—the Golden Temple—have rocked the whole country. Extremists seeking to separate the state of Punjab from India and form a separate state of "Khalistan" took control of the temple just as they did 4 years ago. They turned it into a weapons arsenal and a base for stepping up terrorist activity not only in the state but also in other regions of the country. As is well known, hundreds of innocent people have perished at their hands since the beginning of this year. Bombs they had planted once again exploded with a roar in Delhi. The terrorists holed up in the Golden Temple began to shoot at the security forces surrounding the temple. They responded with gunfire to demands that they lay down their weapons and leave the temple. In this situation the authorities had only one way out: decisive action. In the course of a large-scale operation mounted by the security forces, all the extremists were completely flushed out of the territory of the temple complex. More than 200 terrorists were taken prisoner. Thus, Sikh terrorism was dealt a perceptible blow.

The country, including such opposition parties as the Communist Party of India (Marxist) and the Bharatiya Janata Party, has by and large supported the authorities' actions. At the same time, while recognizing the need for the steps that were taken, certain circles believe that the problem cannot be solved by military means alone.

One cannot fail to point out in this connection that the government has taken real steps in recent months to seek a solution to the problem of the state, including through political means. Thus, P.S. Badal, former chief minister of the state of Punjab and leader of the Sikh United Akali Dal Party, was released from jail. The authorities thought that political dialogue could be initiated with his help. These hopes were not well-founded. It soon became

clear that, like other leaders of this party, he does not dare oppose the terrorists. However, in an attempt to take advantage of everything, even the slightest chance, on the path toward a political settlement, the government took the next bold step in March. It released the high priests of the Golden Temple, who had indicated that they would be able to convince the terrorists to renounce terror and embark on the path of finding a political solution to the problems. But this move did not bear fruit either.

Efforts aimed at a political settlement have been considerably frustrated as a result of outside interference. Official spokesmen have pointed out on several occasions that the Indian Government has irrefutable proof of this. Islamabad is making keen attempts to destabilize the situation in India through the Punjab.

This is not merely a matter of training and dispatching terrorists. All their activity is in effect being directed. Recently a meeting was held in Pakistan with the members of the Sikh community's leading organ, the so-called "Panthic Committee," which set the task of advancing as far as possible the idea of Punjab separation from India. Sikhs coming from the United States and Canada who were recently arrested by the Indian authorities admitted under cross-examination that their activity was paid for by U.S. sources.

Terrorists in the Punjab itself are changing tactics. After their unsuccessful attempts to set the representatives of the Sikh and Hindu communities at each other's throats, they began to attack Sikhs who were opposing them. There are daily reports of the murder of whole Sikh families. Communists are often the victims of the terror. Journalists shaping public opinion against Sikh extremism are also being attacked.

It seems that the government is now endeavoring to combat terrorism in several areas at once. Above all it has set the task of mobilizing the public. With this in view the authorities intend to rely, in particular, on the aid of the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party of India (Marxist), which hold influence in rural areas. Evidently the creation in rural areas of armed self-defense groups may be another measure. The forces of order are also stepping up operations against terrorists at the same time. Finally, work will have to be continued to close the border with Pakistan.

The opposition parties approve these specific steps. But at the same time they express disagreement with the government standpoint on other questions relating to the Punjab—not without foundation in a number of cases. For instance, they criticize the authorities for their refusal to meet some of the Sikhs' legitimate demands, in particular, to punish those guilty of the pogroms after the assassination of Indira Gandhi. This could create a more favorable climate for a political settlement. It is obviously impossible to disagree with the opposition's rational proposals to convene an all-party conference to work out a common platform on the Punjab question. It is no coincidence that the fact that Prime Minister R. Gandhi, who previously did not support this aim, recently made a comparable proposal aroused approval in the country. The achievement of nationwide accord may facilitate the solution of this extremely complex problem.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Four-Way Talks on Angola Welcomed

PM2305130988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 May 88 First Edition p 3

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA international observer M. Ponomarev article under the rubric "International Observer Answers Readers' Questions": "The Way Out of the Impasse"—first three paragraphs are KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] In a letter to the editorial office Lieutenant V. Kiselev asks the following questions:

"I have read in the press that talks have been held with the participation of representatives from Angola, Cuba, the United States, and the Republic of South Africa [RSA]. I cannot understand how it is possible for representatives of Angola to agree to sit down at the same table with the racists from Pretoria who have been angrily denounced by the whole of civilized mankind. Nor can I understand why Cuba should be taking part in these talks, or what its role is in events taking place in the south of Africa."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer M. Ponomarev replies to Lieutenant V. Kiselev:

To begin with, Comrade Kiselev, let me recall a number of facts. They will help us to understand the essence of this matter.

The Angolan people gained their independence in November 1975. Since then they have been forced to defend themselves with weapon in hand against the rebels organized in the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] bandit organization, which has the active support of the United States and the RSA. Support is not strong enough a word. The UNITA bandits are in the pay of Washington and Pretoria and they receive extensive political and material assistance from these countries including weapons, even such modern weapons as "Stinger" antiaircraft missiles. It is absolutely unquestionable that without this assistance and support from the U.S. imperialist circles and South African racists, the UNITA men would have been completely defeated long ago.

However, Angola's people have to defend their freedom and independence not only in the struggle against the rebels. They are constantly subjected to aggression from the RSA. South African troops are to all intents and purposes occuping southern parts of Angola; they carry

out raids deep into the country's territory and bomb peaceful cities and settlements. The South African racists' undeclared war against the People's Republic of Angola has been going on for many years.

The Angolan people are not alone in the struggle which they are forced to wage. Cuban internationalist servicemen are fighting at their side. They take direct part in the clashes with the RSA troops which mount raids into Angolan territory and in the fighting against the UNITA rebels. As a result of joint actions with the servicemen of the People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola, the Cuban internationalists have won the Angolan people's recognition and respect.

Those are the facts. And I repeat, the combat operations on the southern border of Angola have been waged for many years now. So far success has eluded the South African racists and their UNITA henchmen. However, the People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola have not been able either, even with the Cubans' help, to decisively defeat the enemy and drive him out of the country's territory. The result, frankly speaking, was an impasse.

However, while even quite recently there seemed to be no way out of this dilemma, the situation has now drastically changed. This is due to the fact that the new political thinking is constantly gaining in strength. And this affects not just the relations between the USSR and the United States. It has manifested itself both in the policy of national reconciliation and in the active search for ways to resolve regional conflicts in various parts of the world. The most vivid examples of this are the Geneva agreements on a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

It seemed likely that the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan might become a kind of model for people involved in armed conflicts elsewhere in the world. And this is exactly what has happened. This is borne out, for instance, by the measures adopted of late by the Angolan leadership.

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola has repeatedly demonstrated its readiness to establish peace in the region. To achieve this, it is necessary for the United States and the RSA to end their interference in Angola's internal affairs, to implement UN Security Council Resolution 435 on the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia, to grant independence to Namibia, and to guarantee the inviolability of its borders. Support for the UNITA gangs must also end. When it became obvious that the RSA and the United States are not yet ready for this, the Angolan-Cuban side proposed that for the sake of a compromise a quadripartite treaty be concluded between Angola, Cuba, the RSA, and the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), which is recognized by the United Nations as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. This treaty is called upon to resolve several issues at once: to ensure the security of the People's Republic of Angola, to bring about the independence of Namibia, and to establish peace between Angola and the RSA. The treaty, or more precisely the draft of the treaty, also contains a timetable for the withdrawal of Cuban forces from southern Angola and their phased withdrawal from Angolan territory altogether.

It was this proposal that brought Angola, Cuba, the RSA, and the United States to the negotiating table. The talks were held in London and lasted 2 days. The joint communique noted that they "took place in a constructive atmosphere" and that "progress was achieved." Furthermore, Chester Crocker, U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs, who took part in the negotiations, stated that "this meeting could be a step toward a settlement since all its participants have already tried military solutions, which are costing the countries of the region dear."

Why Angola agreed to the talks is understandable. It is continuing its active search for ways to establish lasting peace in the country, a search for peaceful and just solutions to the problems of southern Africa, including the decolonization of Namibia, which is occupied by the Pretoria regime. Cuba was guided by the same motives when agreeing to the talks so that, Comrade Kiselev, there is nothing incomprehensible here. The United States tried to make out that it had launched a new diplomatic initiative. And as for the RSA, the continuation of the war in Angola and the occupation of Namibia leads to great material and human losses and exacerbates the country's isolation.

Nonetheless, Pretoria regards the meeting in London as no more than the "opening of a diplomatic window." It has shown no readiness to withdraw its thousands-strong occupation corps from Namibia and has declared that it does not intend to stop its support for UNITA. Washington's representatives are also talking about continued support for these bandits. Nonetheless, a breakthrough was achieved and a way out of the impasse has been indicated. The participants of the London meeting agreed that the quadripartite talks will continue.

It is difficult to say how events will develop further. Angola demonstrated good will in agreeing to direct contacts with the RSA. These contacts will be further developed. After the talks in London another meeting, a bilateral meeting on this occasion, was held between representatives of Angola and the RSA on problems of a settlement in the south of Africa. It took place in the Congolese capital, Brazzaville. Its participants examined the results of the London talks and agreed on another quadripartite meeting, which is also to be held in Brazzaville.

The results of the next meeting will depend to a decisive degree on Washington and Pretoria. They must give up their aggressive course in respect of the People's Republic of Angola and implement the UN decision on granting independence to Namibia. When this is done, it will be possible to resolve all the other problems.

Afghan 'Model' for Angola, Mozambique Considered
LD1905165188 Moscow in Portuguese to Africa 1830 GMT 17 May 88

["Studio-74" program, presented by Igor Potovskiy]

[Excerpt] The quadripartite talks in London between Angola, Cuba, South Africa, and the United States have had repercussions throughout the world. The attention paid to the talks is understandable and legitimate, especially given the current situation in which the road of political dialogue and the [words indistinct] have proved their important and promising nature, as in the case of Afghanistan and in part the case of Nicaragua, maybe the most striking examples of regional conflicts which have lasted for several years. Will dialogue also be as effective in resolving the conflict in southern Africa, a conflict no less deep and dangerous? Probably it is not worth making long-term predictions, but today the U.S., British, and French media are unanimous in their (?skeptical attitude) toward the solution of the conflict in southern Africa through these talks.

As the French LE MONDE noted, in the opinion of most experts progress is hindered by Pretoria's demand for the participation of UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] in the Government of Angola. This is not an isolated demand. Behind it is a very worrying tendency. You have only to remember that not so long ago South Africa made calls for Angola to be ensured prospects for settlement in accordance with the Afghan model, or in other words, to recognize UNITA as an independent political opposition force.

As for Renamo [Mozambique National Resistance], its place in South Africa's (?plans) is different. Pretoria not only does not attempt to promote this group as a national political force but even opposes attempts by U.S. conservative circles that would like to see Renamo as a political alternative to Frelimo [Mozambique Liberation Front] But this is the position now. I think that (?not everyone has forgotten) when South Africa sought to impose talks with Renamo on the Frelimo government through its own mediation. A curious fact: As is known, in the struggle for control of Renamo against the United States, which is willing to recognize this group as a (?potential) anticommunist Mozambican government, South Africa is increasingly leaning on the FRG. However, as some of that country's officials acknowledged, the federal departments have contacts both with Frelimo and Renamo to establish dialogue between the warring sides. This is why it is probably not advisable to categorically judge South Africa's position toward Mozambique. (?Just as the African countries), Angola and Mozambique agree in principle with the resettlement process in Afghanistan and (?there are) attempts to compare the situation there with that in southern Africa.

It is with this question that I would like to start my interview with Studio-74's guest, Atanasio Dimas, editor of the Mozambican newspaper DOMINGO.

[Begin Dimas recording] Well, the Afghan situation in my view differs quite a bit from the situation in Angola and Mozambique. The Afghan situation existed—or, let us say, there was a movement opposing the established government. This movement was recognized by the very government. The situation in Mozambique is different. There is no liberation movement. There is no organized movement. There is simply a war promoted by South Africa.

Well, what methods does it use? A variety: direct aggression, economic aggression, even armed aggression through the armed bandits. This is why there can be no comparison between the Afghan resolution and the problem we face in Mozambique, because in Mozambique we do not have an opposition war as in Afghanistan, as perhaps we can to some extent say in Nicaragua. But in Mozambique we do not have an opposition. What we have is destabilization created by South Africa, which in my opinion by no means wants to set up a government in Maputo. South Africa from my viewpoint does not want to place a puppet government in charge of our country. It wants to gain time so that its internal problems and the apartheid problem can be sides.pped and forgotten (?for a while). [passage omitted] [end recording]

CPSU's Urnov Received by Zimbabwean Official
PM1805131588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Meetings have taken place in Harare between Nathan Shamuyarira, member of the Zimbabwe African National Union—Patriotic Front Central Committee Politburo and foreign minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe, and A.Yu. Urnov, special envoy of the Soviet leadership and deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department.

Sao Tome Minister Thanks USSR for Aid
PM2005111588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Gift From CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] Luanda, 19 May—Guillermo Posser da Costa, Sao Tome and Principe minister of cooperation, has expressed gratitude for the USSR's multifaceted help to that island state off the west coast of Africa. He was speaking in Sao Tome City at the ceremonial presentation of a gift of printing equipment and materials from the CPSU Central Committee to the Central Committee of the Movement for the Liberation of Sao Tome and Principe [MLSTP].

The CPSU and the MLSTP are linked by close bonds of friendship and solidarity whose foundations were laid during the years of our people's struggle for independence, the minister said. The Sao Tome and Principe leadership advocates the further expansion and deepening of all-around cooperation between the two countries.

East Europe

Grosz Explains Future MSZMP Policy

LD2305151388 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Budapest May 23 TASS—The Hungarian party conference has endorsed a new political concept which took shape in eighteen months of extremely rich and diverse discussions. "The decisions of the conference include both the past achievements, which we can take pride in, and a critical analysis of our weaknesses and problems," Karoly Grosz, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, said in a TV interview.

The decisions of the party forum, he continued, provided guidelines for the work of the party's governing bodies, set them the task of energetically working on plans outlined. This new policy means, first and foremost, that new approaches and new relations are needed in social life, human relations and ideological work.

"In international affairs, we will continue even more vigorously along the course pursued until now. We will continue fully to abide by our obligations in dealing with our friends, socialist countries, and help promote the socialist community to the extent our modest possibilities permit. As for the ties with the non-socialist world, we will continue, as before, to pursue an open policy. On the basis of mutual interest, we will continue to support useful, creative cooperation with those who want to work with us. We can say to friends and foes alike what we think about peace, about the morrow. The same is true of the future. We want peace and cooperation on the basis of mutual interests."

Answering a question about the expediency of combining his current posts of the party general secretary and chairman of the Council of Ministers, Karoly Grosz said: "In the not too distant future these functions should be separated. But I have to combine them temporarily. I will seek to tackle this difficult task, relying on the support of my colleagues and the wish of the public to help me. Once the conditions in terms of personnel are created, these functions will be separated."

Speaking before journalists on the results of the Hungarian party conference, Janos Berecz, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, said that the question of establishing the post of the party chairman was solved at a closed session of the party conference. The party chairman was unanimously elected by secret ballot by the Central Committee. "We believe that there is a need to use the experience and opinion of Janos Kadar, who headed the party for 32 years and whose name is linked with all the results and important steps of our country."

Karoly Grosz was unanimously elected general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party by secret ballot.

Polish Spokesman on Summit, Gorbachev Visit

LD2305173788 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Warsaw May 23 TASS—At one with other socialist countries Poland vigorously supports the Soviet initiatives for disarmament and the new political thinking in world affairs, which produce conspicuous effects in the cause of ameliorating the international situation, Stepan Staniszewski, press spokesman for the Foreign Ministry of the Polish People's Republic, said in an interview published in the newspaper ZYCIE WARCZAWY today.

He expressed the hope for movement forward at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow in solving the problems of conventional disarmament in Europe in which Poland is strongly interested. A specific proof of this is the Jaruzelski Plan for slashing armaments and building up confidence in Central Europe. We hope that a favourable international atmosphere, which the summit meeting in Moscow is sure to create, will help normalize Poland's economic relations with Western partners, first and foremost, in the credit and financial sphere, Staniszewski noted.

One should realize that an improvement of the international climate in Europe and Soviet-American rapprochement are a hard and long process and the adoption of the next decisions to be facilitative [as received] to this will not be easy.

On the coming visit to Poland of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, the Polish Foreign Ministry spokesman said that it is an event of extraordinary importance to the Soviet-Polish relations. It will also exert influence on the international situation, including in the context of the problems of the East-West dialogue.

Poland's Malinowski Marks Peasant Day 22 May

LD2305152288 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Warsaw May 23 TASS—The Polish United Peasants' Party expresses its will and determination to undertake vigorous actions to implement Mikhail Gorbachev's global peace initiatives, Roman Malinowski, chairman of the party's main committee and marshal of the Sejm, said in Siedlce on the occasion of the national peasant holiday marked on May 22.

The new thinking and activity developed so vigorously and convincingly by the Soviet leader, Malinowski went on to say, raise the hope of all humanity that lasting peaceful future will come and the necessary mutual trust and cooperation will be promoted. Polish peasants are also striving for peace and cooperation in the whole world, just as inside Poland.

Malinowski emphasized that the current peasant holiday indicated the will of Polish peasants to step up economic, social and political changes, so essential for Poland, gradual implementation of the decisions and conclusions of the 10th Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party and the 10th Congress of the United Peasants' Party, to enrich the union of workers and peasants, to further develop the system of coalition government, implement step-by-step the joint agricultural policy and deepen the allied inter-party cooperation.

We did not conceal from anybody that the path of changes and reforms we had taken up would be long, difficult and sometimes even painful. It calls, above all, for calmness, patience, persistence and hard everyday work.

Speaking at the celebrations Zbigniew Michalek, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Polish United Workers' Party Central Committee, noted the achievements of Polish peasants in developing production and meeting the population's need in food products, and emphasized the need to further modernize Polish agriculture, intensify the production output and constantly improve the living and working conditions in Polish villages.

He said that the Polish Government was aware of the current difficulties and problems facing the farmers and added that the Polish United Workers' Party in cooperation with the United Peasants' Party would always take into account the vital interests of Polish farm workers in their agrarian policy and decision making.

LCY Prepares for Party Conference Objectives

LD2305210088 Moscow TASS in Englisn 2047 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Belgrade May 23 TASS—Radisa Gacic, secretary of the Presidium of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia Central Committee, Stefan Korosec and Ivan Brigic, members of the Presidium, and Marko Lovic, executive secretary of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee, talked in Belgrade today with leading officials of the mass media on the objectives of the newspapers, radio and television in the preparations being completed for the LCY conference and also for the coverage of that party forum. As the TANJUG agency reports, it was noted that the public discussion of the theses for the conference had fully borne out the urgency of the subject, to which the delegates to the forum devote their main attention: A strengthening of the leading ideological and political role of the unity and the responsibility of the League of Communists in the fight for overcoming the socio-economic crisis. The great responsibility was noted of the mass media in creating a favourable climate for a democratic and successful work of the conference, of the all-round and objective information of public on the proposals expressed at it and its mandate.

The objectives of the upcoming LCY conference were discussed today at the joint meeting of the commissions of the LCY Central Committee on questions of development of the League of Communists and ideological and theoretical work. The League of Communists is expected to make at the conference a resolute step in search of a way out of the crisis, Radovan Radonic, member of the LCY Central Committee, said in his opening address.

Analysing the causes behind the present-day economic difficulties, he noted that many of them are a reflection of the subjective mistakes rooted in the late fifties.

Satisfaction was expressed with the fact that the draft decisions are well-balanced. It would be good, the speaker said, if the conference proceeded in the same spirit.

Romanian Friendship Group Celebrates Anniversary

AU2105154988 Bucharest AGERPES in English 1500 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Moscow, AGERPRES, 21/5/1988—The Culture House of Moscow's polygraphic enterprise "Krasnyy Proletarii" hosted a festive meeting devoted to the celebration of 30 years since the foundation of the Soviet-Romanian Friendship Association [SRFA].

L.D. Kazakov, member of the CC of the CPSU, secretary of the Central Council of the Trade Unions, vice-president of the SRFA central management, and Academician Radu Voinea, member of the CC of the RCP, president of the Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania, head of the delegation of the Romanian-Soviet Friendship Association attending the events organized in the USSR, took the floor.

Voronin Meets With Bulgaria's Lukanov

PM1905132388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] On 18 May L.A. Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gossnab, met with A. Lukanov, candidate member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and Bulgarian minister of foreign economic relations. There was an exchange of opinions on questions of the development and deepening of USSR-Bulgarian economic cooperation.

The conversation passed in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

West Europe

UK Nuclear Arms Modernization Plan Criticized

LD2205114088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] Our correspondent Vsevolod Shishkovskiy reports from London:

[Shishkovskiy] The British public have reacted with indignation to the plans, just announced by the government, for increasing military expenditure and embarking on the modernization of British nuclear weapons. They are set out in the so-called "Defense White Paper," presented by Younger, the head of the military department. Although the authors of the paper did not, on this occasion, venture to openly intimidate Britons with the Soviet military threat, since they understand the enormous response that our peace initiatives have evoked in Great Britain too, it does, nevertheless, contain quite a few unsubstantiated claims about the USSR's military superiority. They were necessary so as to somehow justify the Thatcher government's unconstructive stand on the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe, and London's reluctance to join in the process of reducing nuclear arsenals now under way. This is shown by the intention to continue, at an accelerated pace, to equip the British submarine fleet with the latest Trident nuclear missile systems and to begin the modernization of existing nuclear weapons. It is proposed, specifically, that the arsenal of atomic bombs should be replaced by air-launched cruise missiles, so as to significantly broaden the British Air Force's nuclear strike capability.

In short, London prefers to live and think in the old terms. This face is recognized even by many organs of the bourgeois press, while the MORNING STAR, the newspaper of the country's progressive forces, regards the steps being taken by the Thatcher government as undermining international efforts toward reducing nuclear weapons and strengthening trust and peace.

Thatcher Doubles UK 'Secret Service' Funds

LD2205084388 Moscow TASS in English 0735 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] London May 22 TASS—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has secretly doubled appropriations for the needs of the secret service. At present the service's new budget is estimated at 300 million pounds sterling. This was reported by the SUNDAY EXPRESS newspaper today with reference to government sources.

The newspaper writes that the measure was taken to fund the "undeclared war" against terrorism. MI-6, the Secret Intelligence Service, the SUNDAY EXPRESS writes, has immediately "reinforced" its Middle East headquarters in Cyprus and "key" stations in Beirut, Tel Aviv, Amman and Damascus. Additional counter-terrorism staff have also been posted to The Hague, Bonn and Paris. The officers will transmit their information directly to London.

Thatcher Reception of Artistes 'Unprecedented'

PM2305132188 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 21 May 88 p 2

[TASS correspondent Yu. Levchenko dispatch "specially for SOVETSKAYA KULTURA": "UK: M. Thatcher Receives Soviet Artistes"]

[Text] No prime minister of Great Britain has ever received at the official residence foreign artistes on a tour of the country. Now the tradition has been broken. At the end of its tour, a group of members of the Moscow Military District's Song and Dance Ensemble was invited to 10 Downing Street, where it was received by Margaret Thatcher.

This is the head of government's second meeting with the Soviet artistes. The first took place at the start of the tour at Albert Hall, where Mrs Thatcher was present. The performance made such a strong impression on her that during the intermission she went backstage to convey her personal congratulations to the performers.

The unprecedented reception hosted for the Soviet artistes demonstrates graphically the great strides that have been made in recent years toward the improvement of Soviet-British relations. Personalities from the world of culture, art, and science, creative collectives, and shows and films from the Soviet Union are frequent visitors to Great Britain.

FRG Spokesman on Expectations for Moscow Summit

LD2305192388 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Bonn May 23 TASS—The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany expects the upcoming summit meeting in Moscow between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan to give a fresh important impetus to the process of disarmament and improvement of East-West relations as a whole. A statement to this effect has been made in Bonn today by Friedhelm Ost, an official spokesman for the FRG Government.

After the signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, he stressed, it is necessary to take fresh steps on the way towards disarmament and arms control. The Moscow summit meeting shall, in the opinion of the FRG Government, bring about specific results towards a 50 per cent cut in the strategic nuclear weapons, outline

measures of control for the observance of such an agreement. The spokesman for the West German Government stressed that it takes positive cooperation between the two great powers in resolving regional conflicts, broadening contacts in the humanitarian field and also in the field of the economy and research.

FRG Ambassador on 'Fruitful Cooperation'

LD2305202688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; address by FRG Ambassador Andreas Meyer-Landrut marking the 39th anniversary of the declaration of FRG Basic Law]

[Text] Respected viewers, over the past 39 years, the main landmarks in the development of relations between our countries are: the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1955 and the conclusion of the Moscow treaty of 1970. Together with the quadrilateral agreement of 1971, and the Helsinki Final Act, the Moscow treaty determined a course of development aimed at reducing tension in Europe, at cooperation, and the growth of mutual trust.

The political development of the post-war period led to the division of Europeans and Germans. In this context, Federal President von Weizsaecker stated during his official visit in July last year here in Moscow, that precisely because of this division and the related consequences for people, we have a need for peace to a particular degree. For this reason, we utilize all our energy for detente and for cooperation between the West and the East with the aim of creating just, endurable, and peaceful relations in Europe. Together with our allies, we are exerting all our efforts to advancing the resolution of such an important task as disarmament. We are ready to extend cooperation in the sphere of economics, science, and technology. We feel that cultural exchanges and human contacts have a particular significance for mutual respect and mutual understanding between peoples.

Conducting a policy of dialogue and cooperation, my government attaches particular, central importance to relations with the Soviet Union. After all, the conflicts of this century apart, there is also a tradition of most fruitful cooperation. We want to continue this tradition. The planned summit meetings between Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will lend, I am certain of this, new and powerful stimulus to cooperation between our states.

The improvement in relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union coincides with a time of fundamental changes in your country. My countrymen are following the process of restructuring in the Soviet Union with particular attention and understanding [simpatiya].

There is much which links the people in our countries with each other. We can build on this. Our efforts are aimed at deepening and improving our relations.

On behalf of the FRG Government and all my fellow citizens, I convey to you cordial greetings and wish you great success in work for the future of your country. Thank you for your attention.

Official Notes Portuguese Expertise on S. Africa

PM2005142988 Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS in Portuguese 18 May 88 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Portugal Knows Situation in Southern Africa Better"]

[Excerpt] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin said in Lisbon yesterday that Portugal knows better than his country the situation in southern Africa.

Adamishin was replying in Russian to questions from journalist Carlos Fino at the conclusion of the meeting which he had at the Necessidades Palace with Secretary of State Durao Barroso, at which the problems affecting the subcontinent, and specifically the internationalization of the civil war in Angola, were the main topic.

The Soviet deputy minister refused to accept that the solution to the Angolan conflict entails the partition of Angola into two parts, arguing that "any reasonable and sensible person is opposed to the partition of a state into two, whether it be Angola or any other country."

However, he also added, "it is beyond any doubt that the Soviet Union will continue to assist the Luanda government, including in the military field."

For his part, the secretary of state for foreign affairs and cooperation stated that the meeting with Adamishin amounted to "an exchange of views" on what is happening in southern Africa. In addition, he stressed that it is "very positive" for Portugal to do everything within its power for finding a peace solution for that area of the world. [passage omitted]

U.S. Maneuvers in Belgium Reported

LD2005133588 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Brussels May 20 TASS—Twelve C-130 military transport planes are taking part in manoeuvres held by U.S. Air National Guard units in Belgian territory, the Belgian Ministry of Defence said today.

The manoeuvres were started at a Belgian air base at Coxyde on May 15 and will last for another week.

According to the ministry, the manoeuvres' goal is to practice military transport flights over the territories of Britain, Spain, West Germany, Italy, Belgium and Greece with a view to getting acquainted with European air space, the existing flight rules and atmospheric conditions.

Party Alignments Ahead of French Poll Viewed

PM2305100188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 May 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "France: Election Races Again"]

[Text] Paris—An important stage in the preparations for the upcoming National Assembly elections, to be held in two rounds on 5-12 June, is being completed: the nomination of candidates for 577 deputies' seats by the political headquarters of the various parties.

Following their heavy defeat in the presidential election, the right-wingers have decided to temporarily defer the question of regrouping forces, have damped down the discord, and are hoping at least to emerge from the coming battles with the smallest possible losses, if not to retain their majority of seats in the National Assembly. Therefore, their two leading parties—the Rally for the Republic [RPR] and the Union for French Democracy [UDF], the latter of which includes centrists—have agreed to nominate a single candidate in the overwhelming majority of constituencies under the new auspices of a so-called "Rally and Center Union." However, this will hardly seriously increase their chances of success.

As for the socialists, they have declared their readiness not to put forward their own candidates in approximately 40 constituencies so as to enable centrists to run in them. But such expansive gestures toward recent opponents are eliciting protests in the provinces from UDF representatives who are reluctant to give up their seats to rivals.

On the whole, the centrists' position is distinguished by its contradictory nature. "We favor an alliance (with right-wingers)," J.-P. Soisson, one of the leaders, said, "but the center must make its position clearly known. The country's division into a right-wing and a left-wing bloc does not accord with its interests."

The ultraright-wing "National Front" believes that the right-wingers' nomination of a single candidate, without an alliance with it, will lead to their crushing defeat. J.-M. Le Pen, its leader, is threatening to use against the RPR and the UDF the almost 4.5 million votes which the "ultras" received in the presidential election. Le Pen himself and his immediate entourage will run in Marseille, where the "National Front" holds strong positions.

The purpose of the National Assembly elections, Communists declare, is to prepare an alliance of the French Socialist Party with a section of the right-wingers. The French Communist Party [PCF] has begun preparing for the election. It will take place under particularly complex conditions for the Communists. Under the undemocratic majority system of voting in two rounds reinstated by the right-wingers, a Communist candidate has to obtain three times as many votes as a representative of the right-wing parties or the UDF in order to be elected a deputy. The PCF continues to advocate a very broad amalgamation of the people's forces with a view to pursuing a policy which accords with the working people's interests too.

Former Prime Minister R. Barre—to the great displeasure of his partners, who accused him of defeatist sentiments—is predicting victory for the socialists. As a matter of fact, there is nothing unexpected about the prediction: It coincides with the results of polls. According to the latest of them, on the mainland (excluding overseas departments and territories) the left-wing parties will obtain 352 seats in the National Assembly, and the right-wingers and "ultras" 203 seats.

Spaniards Protest U.S. Bases, NATO

LD2305154888 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Madrid May 23 TASS—Thousands of Spaniards converged on the central motorway Madrid-Gran Via on Sunday carrying banners, antiwar streamers and posters in protest against NATO membership and military bases. The demonstrators then marched through the streets of the capital chanting slogans "we need neither bases nor NATO," "guarantee Spain's non-nuclear status", "no to the Western European Union," "for pursuing the policy of neutrality."

The peace march was held at the call of the United Left Coalition, which, in particular, includes the Communist Party of Spain and the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain, working commissions, a number of antiwar and other mass organisations.

The elimination of nuclear weapons continues to be the most urgent demand of the peoples of the world, the protestors said in a manifesto. They hailed the Soviet-U.S. intermediate nuclear forces treaty as the first nuclear disarmament agreement in history.

"We are for a Europe of peace and disarmament, for a continent free from nuclear weapons from the Atlantic to the Urals, for banning nuclear tests, against the militarisation of outer space, for scrapping U.S. military bases in Spain, for preventing nuclear weapons in Spanish territorial waters and air space."

"Our march signifies the beginning of a nationwide campaign in protest against drawing the country into the West European Union and into NATO military system."

Ignacio Gallego, chairman of the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain, told TASS correspondent Robert Serebrinnikov. "These plans," he said, "run counter to the spirit of time, the growing tendencies towards peace, disarmament and detente. The forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow is expected with great interest in Spain. All people of goodwill hope that it will produce fresh steps further curbing nuclear weapons and reducing armaments."

Latin America & Caribbean

Kamentsev Continues Cooperation Talks in Cuba

Documents Signed

LD2105090988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0138 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Havana, 21 May (TASS)—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev reports: A rough draft for the development of foreign economic relations between the USSR and the Republic of Cuba for a period of 15-20 years and an agreement on the implementation of direct production and scientific-technical ties between associations, enterprises, and organizations of the USSR and the Republic of Cuba were signed in Havana last Friday. Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee and chairman of the State Council and Council of Ministers of the Republic, attended the official ceremony of the signing of the documents.

Work on preparing these documents was completed during the 18th session of the Soviet-Cuban intergovernmental commission for economic, scientific and technical cooperation, which took place here on 16-20 May. The Soviet delegation at the talks was headed by Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Cuban delegation by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, deputy chairman of the State Council and Council of Ministers of the Republic. The discussion of the questions at the session passed in a frank, warm, and friendly atmosphere.

A protocol was also signed on the results of the commission's session which envisages, among other things, that in the field of economic and technical cooperation, main efforts in the next few years should be concentrated on building major projects of the Cuban national economy with the assistance of the USSR. These include the Juragua atomic power station, the nickel works in Punta Gorda and Las Camariocas, a factory in Cienfuegos, an oil base for accepting heavy-tonnage tankers in Matanzas Bay, the Jose Marti Metallurgic Works, and a number of others. The sides also agreed to take measures for the swift assimilation of the planned capacities of enterprises built in Cuba with Soviet assistance.

In addition, measures were mapped out for fulfilling concept within the framework of the comprehensive program of scientific and technical progress of the CEMA countries up to the year 2000.

Session Ends

LD2105205388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Viktor Gorbachev, our correspondent in Cuba, reports:

The 18th session of Soviet-Cuban intergovernmental commission on economic and scientific-technical cooperation has ended in Havana. The Soviet delegation was headed by Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The Cuban delegation was headed by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of Cuba, and deputy chairman of the State Council and Council of Ministers.

After the end of the talks, Comrade Kamentsev said the following in an interview with a correspondent of the State Commission for Radio and Television:

[Begin Kamentsev recording] We signed three documents, including a protocol on the 18th session of the commission on urgent questions that are very important and need to be solved. We also signed an agreement on direct contacts: This is a new direction in our cooperation. We signed a rough draft which determines our long-term prospects as well. I consider that all these documents are of equal value because they determine in a balanced way how we will proceed today, tomorrow, and the day after. We have moved from a simple growth in trade, from a simple growth in rendering assistance in the building of enterprises to questions of direct contacts and to questions of setting up joint enterprises. [end recording]

For his part, Comrade Carlos Rafael Rodriguez described the results of the commission's work in the following manner:

[Begin Rodriguez recording in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation] I think that we have signed very important agreements determining the development of our relations for a period of 15 to 20 years. The fact that we now are working on such a long-term basis shows the degree of maturity of the Cuban economy. Today we are talking about matters concerning the present day and the future. We are talking about Cuba's electronic industry, about biotechnology and machine building. We also have signed an agreement on direct contacts between enterprises and establishments. They will increase our potential. These will be direct contacts between states with different levels of economic development. We realize that the difference in the levels of development creates difficulties, but we think we can overcome them and reach an agreement on how to do so. [end recording]

Chilean Communist Party's April Declaration

PY2305134288 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2030 GMT 19 May 88

["Text" of PCCh Declaration issued in Santiago at "the end of April"]

[Text] The PCCh [Communist Party of Chile] expresses its solidarity, without reservations, with all sectors of workers and people who assume aggressive and active attitudes of protest. The PCCh expresses its support to the railroad workers struggle in defense of national sovereignty, to the different labor and professional associations currently on strike, to university students in their dynamic mobilizations, to shantytown dwellers in their struggle for better housing, and to the Mapuche people's mobilization in defense of their land.

These struggles indicate that the Chilean people are active and that they consciously or instinctively understand the need to join the struggle for freedom and the struggle for their basic rights.

The PCCh is conscious of the unbearable living conditions of the majority of Chilean which results from the forced imposition of the dictatorship's economic policies. Chile has been transformed into a country of 5 million poor people, where unemployment, misery, hunger, and insecurity are the rule. The brutal cut in government social expenditures is one of the causes of this dramatic situation. The reality of the country is the most visible proof of the urgent need for a change of government.

These problems must be the main concern of all democrats when deciding what to do to prevent the perpetuation of the regime through a fraud in the plebiscite.

PCCh Secretary General Luis Corvalan's article continues to have far-reaching repercussions. It has been the cause of considerable soul searching, of misunderstanding by some democratic leaders, and of well publicized misinterpretations and attacks by the dictatorship press led by EL MERCURIO.

Corvalan has clearly established the PCCh position before the plebiscite. His views reject illusions and reflect the obvious reality. This for those who want to view current, actual reality. There are only two unavoidable alternatives for our country: democracy or fascism. Chileans must make up their minds regarding these alternatives.

The dictatorship has conceived the plebiscite as a gigantic fraud to perpetuate the regime and Pinochet's personal power. Second, the plebiscite, regardless of the result, will not lead to a democratic system of government. On the contrary, if it is held with opposition parties participating as a coalition, united only by electoral convenience, it might facilitate the continuation of the regime and the perpetuation of Pinochet in power.

We cannot seriously talk about democracy if a decision is not made to break with the institutional order imposed by the tyranny. The necessary rupture, that is, the construction of a new institutional order, will only be possible by social mobilizations and by the majority of Chileans' openly rejecting the present regime.

The plebiscite can contribute to creating the necessary conditions for a democratic change if opposition leaders drop their illusions, if they reject the simple union for electoral purposes, and if they work together against the main enemy by rupturing the institutional order to force a change of regime.

These are the Communist views regarding the current situation. The PCCh appreciates the attitude of rupture that some political parties, especially from the left, and some progressive sectors of other parties, imply with their decision to support the no-vote in the plebiscite. This position of rupture forms the focus of general agreement of all anti-facist forces, of all democrats, whether they decide to vote or not.

The position of rupture is the only democratic option before the plebiscite. Either you favor a democratic rupture or you favor conciliation, which means the continuation of some of the worst features of the regime.

Some sectors speak of an alleged indefinition of the PCCh before the plebiscite because the PCCh has not assumed a position regarding the electoral issue as such. The discussion of electoral alternatives is only a diversion from the principal goal of creating real conditions for ending the regime. The PCCh will in time assume a position that will answer the people's interest to enhance the idea of a rupture with the fascist regime. This will only be possible through a strong mass mobilization.

The Communists are conscious that the plebiscite will create a political awareness that offers the possibility of transforming the fraud into a fiasco for the dictatorship.

The fierce disputes within the forces that still support the dictatorship are a manifestation of this awareness and reflect the depth of the crisis. There is a feeling among members of the reactionary forces that the regime does not have a future.

The discussions around the plebiscite is causing sectors of the political center to raise their voices against the dictatorship. Important sectors of the people are joining the struggle against the dictatorship and are entering the political arena by joining groups supporting the no-vote. These are facts.

However, this processes will have real meaning and will gain strength if they drop all electoral illusions and use the political room that the regime is forced to grant

them, to work for what is more essential: the social mobilization, the protest against the fraud, and the firm demands for minimum conditions to participate in any electoral event.

EL MERCURIO attacks the position proposed by the PCCh secretary general to place social mobilizations at the center of the PCCh strategy and speaks about two Communist paths. The purpose of this deceitful and false argument is to divide the opposition. The truth is that the PCCh has a single and coherent policy: the policy of the popular rebellion of the masses to promote the democratic struggle, which is directed at breaking the strong institutional frame that purports to perpetuate facism in the country.

This policy contemplates the necessary use of diverse forms of struggle to channel the will of the majority and to finish with the violence that was unleashed against the people over 15 years ago.

Unfortunately, some opposition leaders refer to these suppositions in their political speeches. This is the case of Patricio Aylwin [leader of the Christian Democratic Party] who makes every possible effort to diminish the PCCh's stance by once again dragging up the so-called civilized solutions, a name he uses to try to conceal attempts to materialize a negotiation being made behind the peoples' backs and which will, undoubtedly, not favor a true democracy.

As Corvalan has said, the PCCh does not dismiss a possible agreement with the Armed Forces, but it believes that if an agreement is reached, it will have to be under a new Armed Forces leadership. The problem is, what type of agreement should be reached? If the quest for this agreement is based on weak stances, inclined to making concessions and restricting democratic rights, without the participation of the active forces of the movement of the masses, the result will be a poor imitation of democracy, or a mere failure.

Mr Aylwin must take into account and reflect on the successive stories about this type of negotiations and their results.

The dialogue between the Democratic Alliance and Sergio Onofre Jarpa in 1983, based on the idea of paralyzing social mobilization, the so-called National Accord, independent of any mobilization and, in fact, against it, as well as the letters that go straight into the trash cans of the Government Junta members, should be enough to convince even the most unruly that this path has no future, that it is uncivilized because it has only contributed to barbarism, and that it does not contribute to the impact that voting against the government will have. However, without the resolute action of the people, of all democrats without any exception, the option for the no-vote will only represent an expression of hope. Mr Aylwin must take into account how all us democrats work so that—if the plebiscite is held—his statement a week ago that Pinochet must leave immediately, and that truly democratic elections should be held within 3 to 6 months, may materialize.

In order to achieve this objective, there should be consensus on the decision to break away, the political struggle should join the socio-economic struggle, and coherent decisions should be made.

A conciliatory policy means going backward in the social field, lowering the scope of necessary changes in the model imposed by the regime, and guaranteeing the interests of the small minority that has benefited by its implementation, mainly the multinational enterprises and the local capitalists.

We view, with concern for the people, that the persistent use of dividing arguments seek principally to restrict the social transformations that should accompany a democratic recovery, if the construction of a stable government is sought. The PCCh believes that the leftist sectors are mainly responsible for preventing this from happening.

Therefore, we are making an effort to develop the united left, to develop the need for it to launch its program, and to adopt the initiatives that will lead the masses to occupy the place they deserve in the political arena.

The more strength the leftist sector's unitary ideal gains, the greater its contribution to a democratic outcome built by the entire opposition.

Our people have enough strength to win. They are not alone in their struggle for democracy. Their struggle is supported by those who struggle for their own rights and freedom.

We have the support of a great international solidarity that repudiates the dictatorship. We also have the duty to express our solidarity. We deem it necessary to voice our support for the people of Nicaragua who struggle to curb the imperialist aggression, to demand the end of the shameless Yankee intervention in Panamanian affairs, and above all, we express our solidarity with the Palestinian people and support them in their effort to construct their national state, the necessary cornerstone to guarantee peace for the people of the Near East, including the Jewish people.

April 1988.

Political & Social

CPSU Central Committee Plenum Promotes Karpov

LD2305140888 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1255 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow; 23 May (TASS)—Here follows the full taxt of the information report on the CPSU Central Committee plenum:

Information Report on the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

A regular plenum of the CPSU Central Committee was held on 23 May 1988.

The plenum examined the matter "of the draft theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th all-union party conference." M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke about this.

The following persons spoke at the plenum: Comrades V.P. Demidenko, first secretary of the Kustanay Obkom of the Kazakh Communist party; A.N. Gerasimov, first secretary of the Leningrad Gorkom of the CPSU; G.G. Vedernikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow Obkom of the CPSU; B.I. Gostev, USSR minister of finance; F.V. Popov, first secretary of the Aitay Kraykom of the CPSU; G.I. Revenko, first secretary of the Kiev Oblast Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party; L.A. Borodin, first secretary of the Astrakhan Oblast Party Committee; R.B.I. Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian Central Committee; A.A. Logunov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, rector of the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov; Ya.P. Pogrebnyak, first secretary of the Lvov Oblast Committee of the Ukrainian Comminist Party; Ye.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; G.M. Korniyenko, first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee; D.I. Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee; V.A. Ivanshko, first secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party; Ye.F. Muravyev, first secretary of the Kuybyshev CPSU Oblast Committee; V.V. Zagladin, first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee; G.V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee; A.P. Nochevkin, first secretary of the Odessa Oblast party committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave the concluding speech.

The plenum adopted a decision [postanovleniye] on the matter discussed. It will be published in the press.

An organizational matter was examined at the plenum. The plenum promoted V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers Union, from candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee to full member.

With this, the plenum ended its work.

Decision Announced

LD2305132988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1317 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 May (TASS)—Following is the full text of the decision [postanovleniye] of the CPSU Central Committee:

Decision [postanovleniye] of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum of 23 May 1988 on the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

1. The theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th all-union party conference, presented by the Politburo of the Central Committee, are approved.

2. The theses of the CPSU Central Committee are to be published in the press for broad discussion in party organizations and among all working people.

3. M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is tasked with delivering the report to the 19th all-union party conference.

Ligachev Addresses Plenum

LD2305165488 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1555 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 May (TASS)—At a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee today, a draft theses for the forthcoming 19th all-union party conference was discussed and approved. This was reported by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the Commission on Foreign Affairs of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He spoke at a joint session of the commissions on foreign affairs of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin today, which continued the discussion of the ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

Yegor Ligachev stressed that the theses, which formulate the paths for further movement of the USSR along the road of radical economic reform, democratization, and glasnost, will be published in the press and put out for nationwide discussion. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted that the plenum also discussed the most important aspects of the foreign policy course of the CPSU and of the Soviet state.

Supreme Soviet Session Opens 24 May

Presidium Approves Agenda

LD2305182788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] In the Kremlin today, under the chairmanship of Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, a session was held of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. A question connected with the holding of a routine session of the USSR Supreme Soviet was examined. Points of the agenda and procedure of the work of the session of the supreme body of state power of the country were discussed and approved.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium discussed the question of the completion of the preliminary examination in the standing commissions of the chambers of the draft law on cooperatives of the USSR and the results of the preliminary examination in the standing commissions of the chambers of materials on the question of the work of local soviet and economic bodies for ensuring fulfillment of the program of housing and cultural and consumer construction. Then the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium listened to a report on the preliminary examination in the commissions for legislative proposals of the chambers of materials accounting for the work of the USSR Supreme Court. Decrees of the Presidium, adopted in the period between sessions were submitted for ratification by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Certain other questions of state affairs were also examined.

Taking part in the debates on the questions on the agenda were Comrades Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, and Solovyev.

Leaders Attending Listed

LD2405073188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] The 9th Session of the 11th Convocation of the USSR Supreme Soviet began work today in the Great Kremlin Palace. Deputies and guests greeted with applause Comrades Gorbachev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Nikonov, Ryzhkov, Slyunkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Shcherbitskiy, Yakovlev, Demichev, Dolgikh, Maslyukov, Razumovskiy, Solovyev, Talyzin, Yazov, Baklanov, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Lukyanov, Medvedev, and Kapitonov.

Voss, Ligachev Speak

LD2405092688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0555 GMT 24 May 88

[Opening of the Ninth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, chaired by Avgust Voss, chairman of the Council of Nationalities—live]

[Excerpt] [Voss] Comrade Deputies! The 9th Session of the 11th Convocation of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is declared open.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR proposes to examine the following matters at this session:

1. Changes in the composition in the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The issue is proposed by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet;

2. The USSR draft law on cooperatives in the USSR. The issue is proposed by the USSR Council of Ministers;

3. The work of local soviet and economic bodies to ensure the fulfilment of the program of residential, cultural, and consumer service construction in light of the decision of the 27th CPSU Congress. The issue is proposed by the USSR Council of Ministers;

4. A report on the work of the USSR Supreme Court. The issue is proposed by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet;

5. Confirmation of the decrees of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The issue is proposed by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The proposal to include these issues on the agenda of the session has been approved by the Councils of Elders of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities.

Are there any other proposals on the session's agenda? No other proposals.

In that case we move on to the voting. Deputies from the Soviet of the Union will vote. All those in favor of confirming the session's agenda as presented please raise your hands. Please lower them. Against—nobody. Abstentions—also none. The agenda is confirmed by the Soviet of the Union.

Now deputies from the Soviet of Nationalities will vote. All those in favor of confirming the agenda, please raise your hands. Please lower them. Against—nobody. Abstentions—none. The agenda is also confirmed by the Soviet of Nationalities. Thus the agenda for the ninth session is adopted.

Comrade deputies! On behalf of the Councils of Elders of the chambers , I put forward the following proposals on procedures for the work of the session for you to examine:

The matter of changes in the composition of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet should be examined at this joint sitting of the chambers. At this same sitting the report on the draft law on cooperatives in the USSR should be listened to, and the supplementary report of the chambers' standing commissions on this bill; Discussion of the bill to be held at a separate sitting of the chambers. The sitting of the Soviet of the Union is to be

held today, at 1500 in the chambers' hall of sessions. The sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities is to be held tomorrow at 1000, also in the Chambers' Hall of Sessions;

Voting on the draft law to be held at the second joint session of the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities, which—it is expected—will start tomorrow, 25 May, at 1500;

The report on the work of the local soviet and economic bodies to ensure the fulfilment of the program of residential, cultural, and consumer service construction in light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the supplementary report of the standing commissions on this issue to be listened to at that same sitting;

A discussion of the matter to be held at separate sittings of the chambers. The Soviet of the Union will sit on 26 May from 1000 in the Great Kremlin Palace. The Soviet of Nationalities will sit, also on 26 May at 1000, in the Chambers' Hall of Sessions;

A decision on this matter to be made at the third joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, to be held on 26 May from 1500;

The report on the work of the USSR Supreme Court and the question of confirming the decrees of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be examined at that same session.

Do any deputies have other proposals on the procedures for the session's work? No other proposals.

Let us vote. Deputies from the Soviet of the Union vote. All those in favor of confirming these procedures for the session's work, please raise your hands. Please lower them. Agains—nobody. Abstentions—also none. The procedures for the work of the session are confirmed by the Soviet of the Union. The deputies from the Soviet of Nationalities vote. All those in favor of adopting the given procedures for the work of the session, please raise your hands. Please lower them. Against—nobody. Abstentions—none. The procedures for the work of the session are confirmed by the Soviet of Nationalities. Thus the procedures for the work of the session have been adopted.

Comrade Deputies, we will begin examining the first matter on the session's agenda, the matter of changes in the membership of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. I hand the floor to Deputy Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Ligachev] Comrade deputies, allow me on the instructions of the party's Central Committee and the Council of Elders to submit for your examination the following proposals on certain changes in the membership of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. First of all, the deputy chairmen of the Presidium. You know that according to established practice chairmen of the presidiums of the supreme soviets of union republics are usually the deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [as heard] At present Comrade Rafik Nishanovich Niashanov and Comrade Ringaudas-Bronislovas Ignovich Songayla, who previously worked as chairmen of the presidia of the supreme soviets of the Uzbek and Lithuanian Union Republics, have been elected first secretaries of the republics' central committees. Comrade Salamat Mukashev, who worked as chairman of the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet, has retired on pension. A proposal is submitted to release the comrades mentioned of their duties as deputy chairmen of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The party and local soviet bodies of the Uzbek, Kazakh, and Lithuanian Union Republics propose for election as deputy chairmen of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Comrades Pulat Kirgizbayevich Khabibullayev; Zakash Kamilidenovich Kamalidenov, and Vitautas Stasevich Astrauskas, the chairmen of the presidia of the supreme soviets of these union republics.

Now the proposals for the members of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In connection with the fact that Comrade Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has been appointed USSR minister and Comrade Inamzhon Buzrukovich Usmankhodzhayev is now retired on pension, it is proposed that they be released from their duties as members of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The party and local soviet bodies of Moscow, Uzbekistan, and Bashkiriya propose for election as members of the Supreme Soviet Presidium Comrade Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the party's Central Committee, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; Comrade Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, and Comrade (?Ramer Khazanovich) Khabibullin, first secretary of the Bashkir Obkom.

These, Comrades, are the proposals for changes to the membership of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet that are being submitted for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Voss] Comrade Deputies, would anyone else like to speak on this matter? No one. We have to adopt a decision on the proposed changes to the membership of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted: Voss takes on each of the proposed changes in the same order given by Ligachev. All changes are adopted unanimously]

Ryzhkov Presents Cooperatives Bill

LD2405071388 Moscow TASS in English 0704 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, after handling procedural issues and making several changes in the composition of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, began considering a draft law on cooperative societies.

The law would endorse the equality of the state and cooperative sectors.

The draft creates a legal groundwork for the fast development of cooperative societies which, although they had existed before the policy of perestroyka, or restructuring, began, were considered to be of secondary importance. The situation is to change radically if the new law is adopted.

The parliamentary debate on the draft law on cooperative societies will sum up three months of discussion by broad sections of the public.

The Supreme Soviet's working commission which collected amendments to the draft, received more than 200,000 proposals.

A TASS correspondent learnt in advance of the session that the absolute majority of those who made the proposals viewed the document as being good on the whole.

About 10 per cent favoured the postponement of its adoption in order to make drastic amendments.

There are also principled opponents of the cooperative movement, regarding it as departure from socialism.

The final decision on the law will be made by the deputies of the supreme body of state authority. To make the draft a law, the majority of deputies in each of the two equal chambers of the parliament, the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, should vote in favour.

The draft law on cooperative societies was presented to the deputies by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Yakovlev, Dolgikh Armenia Activities Reported
PM2305135988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Stay in Armenia"]

[Text] A.N. Yakovlev and V.I. Dolgikh were in Yerevan 20-21 May.

A.N. Yakovlev met with the leaders of news and propaganda media, VUZ rectors, and representatives of the creative intelligentsia of the republic.

The CPSU Central Committee secretaries had meetings with first secretaries and secretaries of party raykoms and gorkoms.

V.I. Dolgikh also met with the leaders of a number of ministries, departments, major production associations, and enterprises. He visited the "Armelektromash" Association and talked with workers and specialists. During the meetings and conversations they talked about the course of restructuring, the expansion of glasnost and democratization, the implementation of economic reform, and the preparations for the 19th all-union party conference.

A.N. Yakovlev and V.I. Dolgikh laid a wreath at the monument to V.I. Lenin. Wreaths were also laid at the memorial to the victims of the 1915 genocide and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in "Pobeda" park.

There was a visit to the Institute of Ancient Manuscripts—"Matenadaran"—named for M. Mashtots.

The CPSU Central Committee secretaries were accompanied by S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee; G.M. Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and F.T. Sarkisyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers.

Lithuanian Central Committee Plenum Held 5 May
PM2305154988 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 6 May 88 p 1

["Information Report on Plenum of Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] The 11th Plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee took place 5 May 1988 in Vilnius.

With a minute's silence the plenum participants honored the memory of P.Yu. Shidlauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Communist Party Auditing Commission and former first secretary of Radvilishkskiy party raykom, who died 4 March 1988.

The plenum agenda is approved:

1. On the work of Vilnius City party organization to step up the class-ideological, international, and patrictic education of the population in the light of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum.

2. Information from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau "On the Status of the Payment and Recording of Membership Dues in the Republic Party Organization in 1987."

3. Organizational matters.

The report by Vilnius party gorkom on the first question was delivered by K.V. Zaletskas, first secretary of Vilnius party gorkom.

The following spoke in the debate on the report: E.E. Mayauskene, first secretary of Kaunas' Leninskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Raykom; I.L. Belinis, Lithuanian SSR minister of culture; L.B. Vorobyev, chairman of Vilnyusskiy Rayon's V.I. Lenin Kolkhoz; A.M. Maldonis, chairman of the Board of the Lithuanian

SSR Writers' Union; L.V. Adamovich, fitter at the Vilnius Fuel Apparatus Plant named for the 50th anniversary of the USSR; V.K. Yemelyanov, editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LITVA; B.A. Zhyamkauskas, first secretary of Radvilishkskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Raykom; Y.Yu. Anichas, rector of Vilnius State Pedagogical Institute; K.I. Yuralovich, first secretary of Shvenchenskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Raykom; O.I. Buynauskene, leader of a field-crop cultivation sector in the plant-growing division of Kaunasskiy Rayon's S. Neris Kolkhoz; O.O. Burdenko, director of the Vilnius Radiation Measurement Instruments Plant named for the 60th anniversary of October and chairman of the city's War and Labor Veterans Committee; A.A. Matsaytis, first secretary of the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee; A.M. Skorin, party committee secretary at the Vilnius Radio Components Plant; Yu.A. Sklyarov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department; Major General G.T. Taurinskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR DOSAAF Central Committee.

A speech on this matter was delivered by R.I. Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

A resolution on the matter discussed was adopted.

Information on the second matter was delivered by V.A. Berezov, chief of the Organizational Party Work Department.

A corresponding resolution was adopted.

The plenum examined organizational matters.

The plenum confirmed Comrade Ye.I. Parymuda's appointment as chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Industry Department.

The plenum confirmed the appointment of Comrade S.P. Apanavichyus as chairman of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Party Control Commission, relieving him of the duties of chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Administrative Organs Department.

Comrade V.F. Gerzhonas' appointment to the post of Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Administrative Organs Department chief was confirmed.

The plenum relieved Comrade Yu.Yu. Karosas of the duties of editor of the newspaper VALSTECHYU LAYKRASHTIS in connection with his retirement on pension.

The plenum confirmed Comrade V.V. Butenas' appointment as editor of VALSTECHYU LAYKRASHTIS.

Senior official of the CPSU Central Committee V.D. Tkachenko participated in the work of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee plenum.

Zaslavskaya Calls for 'People's Front'

LD2405103888 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0430 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] In Moscow, according to a renowned Soviet sociologist, a people's front should be set up in the Soviet Union in the interests of developing pluralism, because social conditions do not exist for a multiparty system. Zaslavskaya held a news conference with several leading intellectuals. At this, Burlatskiy, chairman of the Soviet Association of Political Science, [title as heard] also said that a reevaluation should be made of what happened in Hungary and Poland in the fifties and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The latter should be carried out by the Czechoslovaks themselves, said Burlatskiy.

Cinematographers Criticize Irkutsk Official

LD2305192288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] In Moscow today a news conference was held for Soviet and foreign journalists, organized by the USSR Union of Cinematographers. It was stressed that the country's documentary film makers had actively joined the struggle for affirmation of the ideals of restructuring approved by the 27th CPSU Congress. The causes hampering creative search and debate of vitally important questions of the cinema in an atmosphere of glasnost were named.

It was noted that the Secretariat of the Board had made the decision to abandon the holding of the first all-union festival of cinema, television, and video nonfeature films in Irkutsk. The fact is, the chairman of Irkutsk Oblast Committee for Television and Radio, Komarov, is not concerned to raise the ideological and artistic standard of television programs and films; he tries to get rid of colleagues not to his liking. Thus, testimonials were used for reprisals against members of the Union of Cinematographers. The Collegium of USSR Gosteleradio decided it was impossible to use Komarov in the post, but at another session it cancelled its former decision and severely reprimanded him.

Taking this into account, the Union of Cinematographers considered it necessary to make the decision to transfer the All-Union Cinema Festival from Irkutsk to another place.

Orthodox Church Leaders on Restructuring

LD2405010488 Moscow TASS in English 2231 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Zagorsk (Moscow region) May 23 TASS—On the eve of the official celebrations on the occasion of the millennium of baptism of Russia a meeting of heads and representatives of churches and religious organizations

functioning in the USSR has been held in the Trinity-Sergius Lavra (monastery). Such meetings have been held here for a number of years now. They draw leading churchmen of all religions from various regions of the Soviet land.

This time the meeting was initiated by Patriarch-Catholicos Iliya the Second of All-Georgia and the Supreme Patriarch Catholicos Vazgen the First of all Armenians. On their proposal Patriarch Pimen of Russia has invited to the Trinity-Sergius Lavra religious figures championing peace. Patriarch Pimen chiared the meeting.

The participants in the meeting discussed questions pertaining to the defence of peace, which is the main objective pacing now all people, including believers. They adopted an appeal to the third special session on disarmament of the U.N. General Assembly, which is to be held late in May.

A communique was adopted on the meeting in the Trinity Sergius Lavra. It says among other things that the believers of the Soviet land together with non-religious brothers and sisters are now actively involved in the salutary perestroyka process, the drive for more democracy and glasnost. The gratifying change taking place in the country creates a more favourable atmosphere for churches and religious associations and broadens possibilities for their pastoral and peace-making missions. The communique stresses the special significance of traditional cooperation in the peace-making service of the churches and religious associations at this crucial juncture for humanity.

In completing the meeting Patriarch Pimen said: "We are gratified that the millennium of the Russian Orthodox Church has served as a cause for a fresh manifestation of love, mutual understanding and beneficial cooperation between our churches and religious associations. We see the celebrations on the occasion of the 1000th anniversary of the introduction of Christianity in Russia as a festive occasion for our common culture and history."

Nomination of Conference Delegates 'Rushed'

PM2305164788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 May 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent N. Matukovskiy report: "Accountable to Tomorrow. Notes From Minsk Party Obkom Plenum"]

[Text] Two issues were discussed at the obkom plenum: The improvement of the public education system and the election of delegates to the 19th party conference. They are both, in their own way, important and, I believe, to a certain extent interconnected. Whom should the modern youth "take as his model in life"?—this is the thought uniting both items on the agenda.

It is probably natural that the capital's oblast is setting the tone in the republic. There is a greater number of highly qualified cadres and a greater opportunity to "test" theory in practice here. But there were no boastful words in the report of obkom First Secretary A.A. Malofeyev. On the contrary, he spoke chiefly about what has to be done.

Those who spoke in the debate also "went along" with the keynote speaker. But some did not like this abundance of "negatives." Why, they said, castigate ourselves like this? A great deal has been done: We have built a lot of schools, produced a lot of teachers, and strengthened the base.

All this is true—they have built, produced, and strengthened. But here is the other side of the coin: There are no secondary schools on the territory of one-third of the farms, 29 kolkhozes and sovkhozes have only primary schools, and 7 have no schools at all.

And do the health and the bad physical condition of the rising generation not create alarm? Children spend 94 percent of their time in school immobile. Therefore one-fifth of young men of predraft age cannot pass the norms of the GTO [Ready for Labor and Defense of the USSR] complex. What is the worth, after this, of the assurances and declarations from platforms that "children are our future and must be taken care of"? Whom will we leave after ourselves?...

Unfortunately, this concerns not just the body but also the mind. Schools are still bad at resolving their basic task of providing in-depth, sound knowledge. By supplementing universal compulsory secondary education with universal vocational education, the reform aggravated the position of both the school and the college [uchilishche]. Both the keynote speaker and the obkom members who spoke in the debate cited simply terrible facts.... Some 72 percent of first-year vocational and technical school students have now failed to cope with the control work in general educational disciplines. Almost one-fifth do not know the multiplication tables.... Subjects in the arts cycle occupy secondary roles in all educational institutions.

The family is to blame for many of the rising generation's troubles. Recently, however, it has become shaky and fragile. Here are some facts cited by A.A. Malofeyev. Last year one family in every three broke up in Minsk, and one in every four in the oblast. Two-thirds of the "broken" families include under-age children. In the oblast there are 11,000 orphans and children left without parental care. Approximately 80 percent of them are orphans...whose parents are alive. Why does this happen?

Discussion of the second item had already begun, but I was still thinking of those 11,000 orphans, three-fourths of whom are orphans with living parents. Then a thought

occurred to me: Had collectives asked the future delegates to the 19th party conference what they think about the most important thing—about who will make our future in the 21st century and how? Yes, all 64 delegates elected at the plenum are, as it were, the creme de la creme, progressive workers, innovators, initiators, but.... But do the people know the thoughts and ideas of each one of them? Do the latter know the thoughts of the people, of all whom they will represent at the unusual party conference? Perhaps an atmosphere of less haste would help this mutual familiarization? Who ordered (or directed) that candidate delegates to the conference be nominated so hastily, why, and for what purpose? Why was it necessary (and who needed?) to "rush through" this most crucial matter in a few days? See what a race there was. On the morning of 16 May I was telephoned, as a member of the Belorussian SSR Writers' Union Party Bureau, to attend a bureau session at 1400. I was asked not to be late, as the bureau had to give its views on candidacies, and a party meeting was scheduled for 1500 to nominate the candidacies. We had not had time to get even halfway through the discussion at the bureau session before...we had to go to the party meeting. And back at the party bureau session the gorkom's representatives had recommended whom we must nominate—which at once created an explosive atmosphere: No, let us do it ourselves!

I emphasize: All this happened 16 May. And 18 May I was present at the obkom plenum which "officially" elected the delegates.

I must point out that the entire election procedure was scrupulously observed. It was directed by party obkom First Secretary A.A. Malofeyev. And, as I have said, the creme de la creme were elected delegates. But only some of them had passed through the fine "sieve" of selection in their own collectives. At the bearing plant, for example, the candidate delegate was chosen from among 13 people, in the Writers' Union from among 10, and so forth.

Nevertheless, the haste gives cause for concern. To a certain extent, I believe, it not only prevents Communists from taking a closer look at the future conference delegates. It is no good for the candidates themselves either. If he had time, each of them could make better preparations to set forth his program, and this would show "who's who."

And then...doubts overcome me: Is it right that 64 candidacies were included on the list for secret ballot? Exactly the number laid down for the oblast according to the norms of representation. For this is a kind of regimentation. With this approach it is possible, as formerly, to register only likes. No candidacies for dislikes are left.

There is still enough time before the 19th party conference. And perhaps it makes sense not to be in too much of a hurry over approving candidate delegates at plenums. Let the creme de la creme be selected in all party organizations, let the maximum number of Communists go through the selection procedure. Setting forth their program and their position in life and in the party. Things have never been worse because of having a choice. Particularly as we are talking about a fateful conference.

KOMMUNIST Chief Editor on Party Conference

LD2305083988 London MORNING STAR in English 19 May 88 pp 6-7

[Report on interview with KOMMUNIST Chief Editor Naily Bikkenin by Kate Clark: "Perestroyka and the Party"; date and place not given]

[Text] Radical, dramatic changes. This is what Naily Bikkenin, editor of the Soviet Communist Party's theoretical journal KOMMUNIST, expects from next month's 19th All-Union Communist Party Conference.

Mr Bikkenin thinks that such changes will bring about a more democratic Communist Party and hence, a more democratic society in the country as a whole. Mr Bikkenin, a Tatar by nationality, is categorical about the need for such changes. And he is not a swimmer with the tide—he went through years of non-promotion during the Brezhnev years because his views didn't fit in.

"We need guarantees for the normal development of the party," Mr Bikkenin says. "We must provide 'natural selection' in politics.

"People should be promoted to leading posts according to their talents, their experience, how well they work, their standing among people, not just because they are in the party.

"Unfortunately," Mr Bikkenin continued, "careerists joined the party during the stagnation years." This, he adds, was one of the problems of being the party which is in power.

"We must make it such that getting an important post does not depend on membership of the party," he stresses.

"There's no reason why a minister should necessarily be a party member, for instance. It should simply be the best person for the job."

The recent controversy around an article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, which was widely seen as a manifesto of the anti-perestroyka forces, brought to light some people's doubts and fears as to whether Socialism itself was being undermined by the radical changes underway in the Soviet Union.

"In the stagnation period, everything that was against the personality cult was considered to be anti-Socialist," Mr Bikkenin points out.

"But that is not so. If social ownership of the means of production is not in doubt and the leading role of the party continues to be accepted—and this we shall never forfeit—together with our Communist ideology, then people's worries are unfounded."

Mr Bikkenin strongly believes, however, that the party has to be stripped of all undemocratic features.

"The centralism we've had so far was not so much democratic as bureaucratic," he says. "So the main issue now is to switch over to true democratic centralism."

As for the direction of the country as a whole, Mr Bikkenin says that "centralism will be retained in strategic areas, in matters of defence, the armed forces and so on. But in the economy the balance has to change."

The Communist Party has to be relieved of much of its administrative and economic management functions so that it can do its real job of political and ideological leadership. The party must learn to talk to the ordinary people again." [quotation marks as published]

Many rank-and-file Communists are urging the party to abolish departments which double up on work of ministries and to cut staffing considerably so as to reduce bureaucracy.

Methods of leadership by party officials had to change, says Mr Bikkenin. The "administrative-command" method of giving orders from the office chair had to go and be replaced by the genuine work of convincing people of the worth of an idea.

"You have to be able to convince people in order to be a leader," he comments.

Another question worrying a lot of grass-roots Communists and non-Communists is that of privileges. A few moves have been made in this direction. Cutting down the numbers of officials allowed to use official cars, for instance.

It is easy to understand how special shops and facilities emerged in conditions of shortages and scarcity. But it is one of the things which causes a lot of resentment and distrust about the party among many non-party people here.

"The use of official cars must be taken under social control," Mr Bikkenin says. "They must be used for business only and nothing else.

"The activities of party workers must be put under the strict control of society."

Another worry some people have, as shown by the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA article, is that of how far to go in denouncing "Stalinism" and whether it is really necessary.

Naily Bikkenin is sure it is: "The causes of the personality cult around Stalin need deep and serious research," he declares. Though he agrees that guarantees are needed to prevent any cult from ever developing again.

Changes are needed in the party rules, he continues, to guarantee a situation whereby party leaders had to care about the opinions of rank and file members, and to guarantee a healthy turnover of leaders.

Many proposals before next month's conference concern elections within the party, most favouring multi-candidacies and secret ballotting.

Other proposals have been made to elect the party's general secretary directly at congresses.

Mr Bikkenin thinks that this would be a "step back from democracy" because, in that case, the general secretary would become superior to the rest of the Central Committee and could only be relected at a subsequent congress.

The pre-conference discussion and the broad debate in an atmosphere of glasnost or openness has revealed the depth and extent of differing views.

Will the 19th party conference therefore be a battleground between pro- and anti-perestroyka forces?

"That will depend on the delegates Communists elect," Mr Bikkenin replies. These are to be elected at regional conferences with one delegate per 5,000 members.

"Those who are against perestroyka do not belong to one section of society alone," Mr Bikkenin continues. "They can be party officials used to issuing orders, administrative functionaries accustomed to what amounts to stealing, or workers used to getting paid regardless of the quality of their work.

"I'm sure that the line of the 27th party congress will prevail, however. I believe that there will be more perestroyka supporters than opponents elected. But there will be fierce debate, of that I'm sure.

"My optimism is bolstered by the critical stage that we are at. When we are in a really critical situation, our people can come up with the courage and persistence needed to fight the crisis."

Bovin Stresses Role of Press Criticism

LD2305083588 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 19, 8 May 88 p 3

[Aleksandr Bovin article: "The Press and Perestroyka"]

[Text] Press Day is usually marked by a meeting, an official and boring report, and stormy (or prolonged) applause. That is a ritual which in the level of stability exceeds even the notorious instructions of the Finance Ministry.

But what if we do not meet and do not applaud? What if we do it come other way? What if each editorial staff tries to publish the best, the most interesting issue of the year on May 5? That would at least be of some use....

But that is of the future, which might never be. Now about the past, which cannot be changed. As I see it, it is precisely the journalists and the press in general who are marching in the vanguard of perestroyka, solving the task posed by the Party—to restructure the public mind, to take people out of the state of social apathy and bring hope back to them. Much, very much has been done in the three years of perestroyka. The press has changed noticeably. This can be said quite honestly.

And yet the "feeling of deep satisfaction", that famous sixth feeling of the Soviet man, is clearly absent. We are only at the very beginning of the road. We are just starting to learn to write conscientiously, to speak the truth and not to tremble at each phone call from the top.

The fact that it took interference on the topmost level for us journalists to correctly react to the now already infamous article by N. Andreyeva arouses great alarm. We lacked the political maturity, the political courage in order to show independent thinking and to go into battle against the mechanism of braking, to defend the Party policy and perestroyka. We ought to learn the lessons.

The main lesson, I think, is that we journalists must confront much more actively, boldly and persistently the pressure of those who are trying—if I may use Mikhail Gorbachev's words—to "take the press in hand", to limit glasnost, those who, acting under the "classical" administrative-command scheme, are imposing their own opinions and assessments on the press. Attempts are still being made (sometimes not without success) to remove the sharpest and most principled items from the pages. Many "unpleasant" facts, and especially their analysis, are still forbidden (more often-semiforbidden).

The arguments are also "classical"—"it might not be understood," or "it might be misunderstood." Or another one—enough of "criticizing," the masses of people must be brought up on "positive" examples." We've heard all that thousands of times. And we've had enough of it!

To divide the Soviet people into the elite ones who understand everything, and therefore have the right to know everything, and the amorphous "mass" which must receive "rationed" information and to put a brake on perestroyka. [sentence as published] The struggle for the reduction and liquidation of the "restricted zones" is going on.

As for the reprimands concerning "positive examples", they are one of the devices with the aid of which the "braking mechanics" would like to take the braking mechanism from under fire. They should not be allowed to do so.

Journalists never lost sight of the precious grains of new experience, of the new attitude to work in all fields of public life. But in order to restructure we must remove everything old and obsolete, everything that hinders the transformation of society, of our transformation. This is the social role of criticism, a role of paramount importance.

Our trouble is not that we have "too much" criticism. The trouble is that criticism often just skims the events, limiting itself to sensational "examples." It is probably high time to go deeper—from consequences to causes, from "examples" to structures and ways of life which give birth to these examples.

And, as I see it, it high time to be more strict and exacting to the effectiveness of critical items in the press. Those who are being criticized are old hands. They learn and adapt themselves. They put up paper walls of answers written for form only. And our readers—I can see that from their letters—are beginning to get irritated: We keep criticizing but to no avail. What's the sense of criticism then?

What is to be done so that there would be sense? I have no ready answer. Maybe an obligatory text should be introduced in the Law on the Press. Maybe there is sense in discussing the question at the next plenary meeting of the Board of the Union of Soviet Journalists. In general, there's a lot to think about in this case.

Press Day is our own, journalists' holiday. Let's mark it with self-criticism. Let's think and talk about where and why we fall short of the new demands and what hinders us from working in the new way. And let us not hope that someone will solve our problems for us.

For perestroyka, for the new press and for the Party cause one has to fight, to fight every day. And not to be afraid of blows dealt in return. Then we'll win.

Media Official Interviewed on Censorship

LD2205060688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1935 GMT 21 May 88

[Interview with Vladimir Solodin, member of the collegium of the USSR Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press, by unidentified journalist on the "Before and After Midnight" program; date and place not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Journalist] We will discuss the problems of censorship in our society with Vladimir Alekseyevich Solodin. He is a very competent man to speak with, as he has been working in this field for 24 years and is currently a member of the collegium of the USSR Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the press. We will talk both about what inspires us with hope, but also about that which it has not been customary to talk about in recent years. Do you agree?

[Solodin] Yes, I agree.

[Journalist] Tell me, why is it that in the first years of Soviet power the young republic was not afraid to publish the works of its opponents and enemies? Why is it that as our country became stronger, there suddenly appeared prohibitions on literature? Did they fear polemics or did they fear an actively thinking people?

[Solodin] I would say that primarily they feared an actively thinking people. Second, they feared polemics. In the twenties Lenin and his companions were in power. They were not afraid. A mass of publications were published, even by our political enemies. We published Denikin at that time, Kornilov, Kolchak; we were not afraid of anything. Then, so to speak, fear of independent thought on the part of the people led to a situation in which all of these writers not only ceased to be published but were also shoved into the special stock.

[Journalist] What functions did you fulfill working all those years in Glavlit [USSR Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the press]?

[Solodin] Well, you know very well as a journalist that we primarily protected state military secrets in the press. At the same time, if material differed from the canonical judgment on a given matter, then we intervened in the (?fabric) of the material, and so to speak, pencilled it and trimmed it. Every fir tree was turned into a telegraph pole; there was such a bitter joke among journalists!

[Journalist] Vladimir Aleksyevich, were you personally engaged in matters relating to artistic literature, for example?

[Solodin] Yes, for 16 years I was the head of the subdivision which controls social-political and artistic literature, and so, of course, I took part in this, and not just took part, I took an active part, and actually used to address this question.

[Journalist] Tell me, what was it that guided the censor, for example, in banning the publication of, say, Tvardovskiy's poem "By Right of Memory" or Anna Akhmatova's "Requiem"?

[Solodin] Because both works served as a reminder, and a very vigorous reminder, of very bitter years and periods in our history—Akhmatova's "Requiem" relates to 1937, the mass arrests, about the horror which came to reign among the people at that time; Tvardovskiy, about the beginning of collectivation and about dekulakization, the dekulakization not of real kulaks, but of those solid middle peasants who had appeared in the Soviet period—these are the reasons why both these works did not see the light of day then.

[Journalist] Vladimir Alekseyevich, were you ever sad that you had to prohibit any works?

[Solodin] Yes, I was.

[Journalist] Tell me, I frankly cannot believe that you and your colleagues decided on your own on the banning of this or that work. Did you consult with anyone or were any guiding instructions issued?

[Solodin] Of course we consulted with interested departments, but we reported all of our decisions to party authorities. In the case of Glavlit, this was to the relevant department of the Central Committee and with their approval....

[Journalist, interrupting] And as concerns artistic literature?

[Solodin] I am speaking of social-political and artistic literature in this case.

[Journalist] But our life is changing and the work of Glavlit is changing too. What can we expect in the near future?

[Solodin] In the near future, the work of Glavlit will focus on the following. We are trying to remove all restrictions in our standard documents which prevent the press and the mass media from gaining access to the shortcomings in the work of ministries and departments. We have succeeded in part; in part we are now working on this. We are doing a lot of work at the moment on, I will be blunt, the elimination of the special stocks in the country. Our people and the specialists know what the historical, literary, and political stock of that time is and there is very little which remains in the special stocks. This includes nationalist literature, anti-Soviet and pro-Zionist literature; this will be about 5-7 percent of the current composition of the special stocks. We are currently doing a lot of work on the effective elimination of the special stocks of foreign literature. All of it—nearly all of it—will be released into the publicly available stocks. This work on foreign special stocks we will definitely complete in July, but already more than half has been done. In the Lenin Library, the literature has been transferred from the special stocks from 1988 to 1978 [as heard].

[Journalist] Thank you for your story.

Podrabinek, Grigoryants on Unofficial Press

PM2005142188 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 18 May 88 p 11

[Harald Hamrin dispatch: "Informal Newspapers Disclose the News in the Soviet Union"]

[Text] Moscow—Every Sunday morning between 11 and 12 Aleksandr Podrabinek stands outside Kropotkinskaya subway station in Moscow handing out his "underground" newspaper EKSPRESS-KHRONIKA. A few uniformed policemen and a couple of men in civilian clothes stand to one side watching.

Aleksandr Podrabinek is 35, short, and has an unruly beard. He has twice been given sentences in labor camps or prison for writing about the abuse of psychiatric medicine in the authorities' fight against dissidents. Even in labor camps he continued his work as an activist.

"So it doesn't bother me very much if a few policemen stand here watching," he said. "I have experienced worse things."

EKSPRESS-KHRONIKA is one of over a hundred "underground" newspapers and periodicals published in the Soviet Union today. Since the first edition was published in August last year Podrabinek has published over a dozen "scoops." The paper has reported demonstrations and protest actions in towns which are normally closed to foreign journalists. It carried a major interview with one of the Armenian nationalist leaders behind the protests in Yerevan and Nagorno-Karabakh. And it has published reports that the pogroms in Sumgait 28 February were led by organized bands that had traveled there from other parts of the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan.

But most of all EKSPRESS-KHRONIKA contains little snippets of information. The paper's guiding light is "quick facts."

"We want to function a little like an independent news agency," Podrabinek said. "Pure impartial information. More or less like REUTER or UPI in the West."

Every Saturday Podrabinek and his colleagues gather in an apartment in a Moscow suburb. There they collate the week's information, type out the newspaper using carbon paper, and staple the pages together. There are generally a few dozen copies, 150 at most, to begin with.

"We have informants around the country," he said. "They phone information in to us. Sometimes they also come to Moscow to report."

And on Sunday mornings Podrabinek together with a couple of colleagues stands outside the subway station, the week's meeting place, and hands out the fresh newspapers. They go first to contacts who travel to Moscow from various parts of the country. EKSPRESS-KHRONIKA generally reaches around 50 cities every week.

"Tallinn will get two copies today," Podrabinek said as he stood surrounded by outstretched hands. "Sverdlovsk and Kiev will get three."

And so EKSPRESS-KHRONIKA's friends go home to Tallinn, Sverdlovsk, and Kiev and each type out a further few dozen copies of the paper. No one knows exactly how big the "edition" is in the end.

Another day I met Sergey Grigoryants in his apartment in northwest Moscow. The dark papered walls are covered in shelves and icons. Like Podrabinek, Grigoryants, who is now 47, has spent around 10 years in prisons and labor camps. He was released most recently in February 1987 under an amnesty which led to the release of a couple of hundred representatives of the dissident movement of the seventies and early eighties.

Almost immediately after his release he began to plan a new newspaper which was given the name GLASNOST—named after the Gorbachev reform policy's slogan of greater "openness."

"GLASNOST should not be compared with the underground samizdat newspapers of the seventies," he said, using the Russian word for "self-publication." "Today conditions are different."

"The day of the traditional dissident newspapers is past," he said, referring for example to the well known CHRONICLE OF CURRENT EVENTS, which in the seventies reported the arrests and trials of leading dissidents. Grigoryants himself was once the editor of such a newspaper, BYULLETIN V, which appeared two or three times a month in the early seventies and contained material about arrests, human rights, and psychiatric clinics in the service of the KGB.

"Today we have to be broader," he said. "We want to carry reports on culture, religion, politics, the environment, all sorts of things."

GLASNOST differs from EKSPRESS-KHRONIKA. It appears twice a month and each number contains around 150 pages. It contains long articles and documents on political and economic questions, on social injustices, and the nationalities problem. A special edition was devoted exclusively to the winter's national crisis in Armenia and Azerbaijan.

The paper's editorial staff numbers around 20 people, some working every day in their leisure time, others a couple of times a week. A few editions of GLASNOST have been duplicated on a copying machine, but Grigoryants was unwilling to reveal how this was done. In principle only the official authorities may own and use the few copiers and stencil duplicators that exist in the Soviet Union (and even ordinary typewriters are registered by manufacturer's number and owner when purchased).

That is why it is no exaggeration to say that it is something of a miracle that this newspaper can appear regularly and is so large.

"We are the largest periodical dealing with social issues in the Soviet Union," said Grigoryants, who also included official periodicals such as NOVYY MIR and others, which only partly contain material on social issues.

Grigoryants told me about "raids" on the cramped editorial offices in a small rented dacha outside Moscow. One day six cars from the police and KGB arrived. Another day, at the end of March, a gang of "bandits" smashed doors and windows, and when one of the members of the editorial staff rang the police they refused to come.

Grigoryants himself has also been arrested a few times and he has been criticized in the official press. He was arrested most recently 9 May after he had opened up his editorial offices for a meeting at which a new "opposition party," the Democratic Union, was to be formed. "Administratively," that is, without a proper court trial, he was sentenced to a week's imprisonment for "disobedience." He was released Monday [16 May] after serving the sentence and on Tuesday he was back at his editorial offices outside Moscow.

"Since there is no law covering the press in the Soviet Union, then I am not breaking any law," he said and smiled one of his few smiles.

Policy on 'Unofficial Associations' Reviewed
PM2305090188 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 19, 8 May p 10

[Text] Work with unofficial youth associations and laws about them are being carried out in the complete absence of glasnost.

A great number of unofficial associations and organizations have appeared of late, the reason being that some existing public organizations no longer satisfy people with their activity, atmosphere and methods. Both great interest and heated arguments are aroused today by these unofficial socio-political clubs. The attitude towards them varies from the desire to understand and back them to the striving to ban and dissolve them. These diametrically opposed assessments reflect the difficulties of the democratization process itself: There is an absence of tradition for tolerating any viewpoints which differ from the official ones. The new concept of a "socialist pluralism of opinions" is entering our lives with difficulty.

In starting work on this article, the first thing I did was to refer to the press of the Komsomol, for who if not the Komsomol is well informed about unofficial organizations? From reading notes and talking with Komsomol functionaries I got the impression that there was a rather alarming attitude toward these associations. In its January 31 issue, in an article about unofficial organizations entitled "Impostors and 'home-made' groups," KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA called the leaders of some of the unofficial associations "social imitators" and accused them of an alleged desire "to lead young people into clannishness and away from large-scale and socially important deeds." It follows from the article that informal associations, acting without the knowledge of the Komsomol Central Committee, are not participants in perestroyka, but fellow-travellers at best.

Given this, how can unofficial organizations have warm feelings for the Komsomol? Can they believe Viktor Bazhenov, secretary of the Moscow City Komsomol Committee, who exclaimed in the Komsomol paper that "I often have a desire to tell about how we, Komsomol functionaries, have changed in our understanding and ability to work with youth."

The guarded attitude of the Komsomol toward unofficial associations is shared by many local Soviets and Party bodies. Until recently, these organizations were banned from staging any street appearances or demonstrations. For example, a demonstration in the Krasnopresnenskiy district of the capital, under the slogan "the law on voluntary public organizations must be submitted for nationwide discussion!" was banned.

The concern of officials about the uncontrollable growth of political clubs is understandable. Most of them are facing such a phenomenon for the first time in their life. But, to be honest, the striving to see in each unofficial an opponent of perestroyka, a provocateur and an enemy is frightening. Such an approach is reminiscent of the events which occurred 50 years ago.

Who are these unofficials? Is there a place for them in our perestroyka? Rakitskiy, vice-president of the Soviet Sociological Association, and a specialist on socio-political movements in the USSR.

"The expansion and deepening of democracy is directly connected to the expansion and deepening of unofficial socio-political movements, which are a form of activating the masses," said Boris Rakitskiy. Most distinguishing feature of unofficial associations is that people participate in them voluntarily consciously and sincerely, not simply hypocritically sharing the ideas propogated by them. [no closing quotemarks as published]

Many staff members of official bodies, unable to deal with people's initiative in a democratic way and being irritated by it, are trying to present the unofficial movement as a kind of "alien element." In so doing, they forget that the establishment of unofficial associations does not run counter to our Constitution, and is quite permissible from a legal standpoint, as well.

Attacks on the unofficial movement have intensified over the past few months. Many members of the voluntary clubs began to lose hope for the support of local Party bodies, the Komsomol and the press. I believe that in this clash both sides are being tested for their faithfulness to the ideals of perestroyka. To pass it, the unofficials must definitively rid themselves of political

infantilism, and develop, instead, a sense of responsibility. And the other side must eventually admit that in the activity of political clubs there are plenty of reserves for perestroyka.

The heated debates going on today surrounding the activity of unofficial associations should soon materialize in the form of an important state document - "The Law on Voluntary Societies", the draft of which is now being worked on. This law will determine the status of unofficial associations and the principles of their relationship to state institutions and public organizations. The law was discussed at a recent meeting of 300 representatives of unofficial organizations with the people who were preparing the draft.

The main report at the discussion was made by Doctors of Science (Law) Vadim Pertsik (of the All-Union Soviet Legislation Research Institute) and Aron Shchiglik (of the institute of state and law of the USSR Academy of Sciences). Contrary to the expectations of those present, these respected lawyers concentrated their reports not on the analysis of the clauses and provisions of the draft, but on the principles of its elaboration. Their speeches were interrupted by exclamations and shouts of disapproval: "Speak about the law! Stick to the facts!" One could easily understand the irritation of the unofficials - only three hours were allotted for the meeting. The lawyers' reports, unfortunately, did nothing to elucidate the situations: they could not even say at what stage the development of the draft law was.

Even a journalist found it difficult to get an answer to this question. Prof. Shchiglik told me he did not know whether the work on the draft law had been completed or not, and advised me to consult the USSR Ministry of Justice which is in charge of its development. Viktor Koryagin, Deputy Head of the Board of Legislation on State Development, said that "the draft law is still being worked on". These words compare poorly with the information provided by the newspaper VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA on February 12 where it said that the draft law has already been worked out and, more than that, is being discussed by scientific social and creative unions. In the end, I was at a loss to understand: did the draft law exist or not, where was it, and was it accessible to the public? It seems to me that this veil of secrecy, and the uncertainty and rumours surrounding the future law will hardly be of good service.

These unofficial associations, growing in number, are, of course, not at all alike; they have their pluses and minuses. But time will separate the vital in what the unofficials propound from what is not. Unofficial associations have become a fact of life today, the result of the democratization of our society. It is not difficult to crush this, but the result will then be only a semblance of democratization.

The political system of Soviet society, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed at the February plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, "should be based on realization of the fact that standing behind each mass organization are definite social strata with their specificities and interests. And the task is not to level them but, on the contrary, to bring them out as fully as possible, take them into consideration and place them at the service of social progress."

Leningrad, Moscow 'Informal' Groups Compared

PM2005110288 Rome AVANTI! in Italian 15-16 May 88 pp 8-10 (AVANTI! Della Domenica supplement)

[Article by Boris Kagarlitskiy, "representative of Moscow's informal clubs": "Behind Informal Groups, a Country Wanting to Change"—first paragraph is AVANTI! introduction]

[Text] Boris Kagarlitskiy is one of the most authoritative representatives of Moscow's "informal" clubs. The "Leningrad notes" that we publish below were written by him following a visit to the former capital where he was able to study the activities of that city's informal clubs, drawing an interesting comparison with those of Moscow, identifying their differences and similarities.

Wednesday 23 March 1988—A sensation occurred at the meeting of Leningrad's Economic Culture Council (SEK). The council members refused to listen to a speaker and decided by a majority that he should leave the room. Since the speaker refused he was forced to do so: Despite his loud protests, the violator of the rules was thrown out of the door and then, following another attempt to enter the meeting hall, was thrown down the stairs. Two days ago the newspaper VECHERNIY LENINGRAD published a detailed report on the event in which it explained to readers that the SEK members had acted entirely legally, since the victim had disrupted public order by refusing to submit to the majority.

The Leningrad press' response to the event is indicative, in a way. In Moscow too conflicts sometimes occur at council meetings of the informal political and social groups, though hitherto they have never led to brawls. In the capital, however, conflicts between the movement's members are of interest only to those involved. The situation in Leningrad is different. VECHERNIY LENINGRAD is not notable for any special love of "informals" but was obliged to inform its readers of what happened that Wednesday, including minor and anecdotal details. The activity of "informal" groups has already become an important part of the city's life and nobody can ignore them.

The important thing that strikes a Muscovite radical visiting the banks of the Neva is the huge difference in the level of development and appearance of the Moscow and Leningrad movements. The former capital is clearly ahead of the present capital from the viewpoint of

democratization. Furthermore it is characteristic that this is due not to any particular liberalism on the local authorities' part but to the democratic forces' organization and vigor.

"Practical specific activity has become established in Leningrad," according to the leader of the Creative Initiative Center (ZTI), Sergey Pilatov. The Center that he heads is so far the only one of its kind in the Soviet Union. Officially part of the Leningrad Komsomol Gorkom, ZTI actually acts as an intermediary between "informal" groups and official organizations, helps secure permission for numerous initiatives, provides informal groups with venues, and even allows the use of Pilatov's telephone for a number of informational communications and the coordination of activities. As for Pilatov, he is not like an ordinary Komsomol official; he really does look "informal." Instead of the normal formal suit, he wears torn jeans and a windbreaker. The walls of the ZTI director's office are covered with the posters of various groups and his desk is laden with samizdat publications. "Left-wingers" say a number of things about Pilatov. One "Delta" group activist was unwilling to tell me about his plans in his presence. On another occasion I was told that "Pilatov is one of us, he is an ex-hippy." The following has also frequently been heard: "He works with us in order to keep an eye on us." Pilatov himself does not deny the latter assertion: "To have a knowledge of the movement and to exert influence within it you have to work within it." The ZTI's influence is indeed felt. The Leningrad "informals" are much more "governable" and until recently most groups, despite their radicalism, have avoided becoming overtly politicized. It is indicative that it was not only from Pilatov but also (and in a much sharper form) from Yelena Zelinskaya—editor of the samizdat gazette MERKURIY, one of the most important publications of the environmentalist organization, Epitsentr—that I heard remarks about "Leningraders' concrete practical activity" as distinct from "Muscovites' politicking approach."

ZTI demands restraint and realism from "informal" activists. To an extent this too benefits the movement. All the more so since ZTI's activity has already produced concrete results. In Leningrad on 23-24 October 1987 it was possible to organize a legal conference of samizdat newspaper editors. The Leningrad authorities—unlike Moscow's—do permit some meetings. In March 1988 the environmental conference organized by Epitsentr was held entirely officially. The Baltic problem was on the agenda. Without a buffer such as the ZTI, the situation would definitely have become more tense and the "informal" groups' work would have had fewer results. In March 1987, when the city authorities began their persecution of Aleksey Kovalev, leader of the "Spaseniye" group, who had organized a demonstration against the demolition of the Angliya hotel, Pilatov did not distance himself from "Spaseniye" members and did not expel them from ZTI, as the more aggressive bureaucrats demanded. Pilatov has boasted about this ever since: "We did not allow the possibility to destroy Kovalev." Of course there are two sides to everything. The demonstration over the Angliya hotel, the activation of the environmental and environmental-cultural groups in spring 1987, and the rapid increase in the number of subscribers to samizdat journals have shown that the Leningrad "informals" are very determined and that they exert real influence in the city. Otherwise Pilatov's mediating activity would not have scored such brilliant successes.

It must be said that the situation in the city clearly helps the consolidation of the "left-wingers'" groups. Leningraders have not yet succeeded in surmounting the "historic humiliation" inflicted on the "cradle of the revolution": From capital of the empire, Leningrad has become a provincial city, with all the attendant consequences. The absurdity of such a situation is evident at all times. The beautiful avenues of the former St Petersburg have been neglected. The plaster is crumbling off the walls of many buildings. The authorities are planning to demolish many old buildings because they lack the funds to restore them.

Usually I would visit Leningrad in the late spring or early autumn, when the city is all in readiness for the tourists' arrival. Now for the first time I have seen the normal Leningrad of early spring—sooty, disorganized, covered in dirt, with a chaotic transport system, terrible roads, and streets even gloomier than Moscow's. The Armenian taxi driver who drove me from one part of the city to another swore wildly whenever the taxi hit a pothole, then suddenly, leaving hold of the wheel, threw up his hands and shouted: "We Armenians will split from these Soviets of yours, after what has happened we will definitely split." This was immediately after the Sumgait anti-Armenian pogrom and everyone was talking about Armenia. Environmental group activists, taxi drivers, and people met by chance on the train were all talking about the events in Yerevan and Karabakh. However, Leningraders' main problems have always been those of their own city, "insulted for no reason." In a way Leningrad has actually benefited from no longer being the capital. The city's population includes fewer bureaucrats than Moscow's, careerists and tramps no longer come here from all over the country, and old houses are not so often demolished for the construction of pretentious official buildings. Leningraders harshly and rightly protest when their city is described as provincial. It remains the second capital of Russian culture and has recently to a large extent also been the capital of the social movements. The city's provincial administrative status has not benefited it, however.

Of course the issue is not just that a considerable proportion of inhabitants feel hurt on their city's account. The reasons for the unrest are much more serious.

The construction of the barrage designed to protect the former capital from periodic flooding threatens to cause an ecological disaster. Lake Ladoga, called "the road of

life" during the war, could soon become the "road of death": The polluted waters of the Ladoga flow into the Neva and thence into the Leningrad water supply system.

The struggle against the barrage project, which violates the Neva valley's ecological status, has become the important general objective of all Leningrad environmentalists. The project was approved without the environmentalists' agreement and basically without even considering the economic implications. The original estimate for the work, R280 million, has already risen to approximately R1 billion. The flow of water in the Gulf of Finland has already been disrupted; pollutants flow into the Neva Bay, posing a direct threat to the city; and the part of the gulf enclosed by the barrage is beginning to turn into a marsh. Leningraders say that the city is threatened by a "second siege"—by the polluted Ladoga on one side and the barrage on the other.

The campaign against the barrage is already achieving some results. The press—not Leningrad's but Moscow's, in fact—has published the first articles reflecting the environmentalist movement's stance. More and more scientists are beginning to cooperate with the informals, going as far as to reject the "suicidal plan." The Baltic'88 conference organized by the environmentalist organization "Epitsentr" was intended primarily to rally the forces of the scientific clubs and of the new social movement in the struggle against the barrage. Initially many bureaucrats would joke: "Let the informals meet: All there will be is a little noise and hot air." The attendance exceeded all hopes, however: As against the 26 informal groups represented at the conference, it was attended by 36 official social organizations, 75 scientists, 19 representatives of state enterprises and agencies, and 15 representatives of the press. In this connection many scientists attended in a twofold capacity. They spoke on behalf of the scientific community and at the same time stressed that they were speaking as advisers to various informal environmentalist groups. Even the Leningrad newspaper SMENA, which wages a constant campaign against the "informals," was forced to recognize the success of Baltic'88.

As was to be expected, the barrage project was criticized very sharply during the conference. Unexpectedly, however, the priority was given to new problems. The representatives of the environmentalist group of the city of Kirishi told how there was a 35-fold increase in cases of bronchial asthma in the city following the opening of a synthetic albumin production plant. "In our city there is no medical compensation [alimentazione sanitaria], no shortening of the working day—absolutely nothing," the environmentalist group's representative, O. Khakimova, said. The infant mortality rate has increased in the city and many inhabitants have left. On 1 June, children's protection day, 12,000 people attended a meeting organized by the "environmental initiative" group to demand the closure or conversion of the deadly factory. The party gorkom took action to prevent the meeting but citizens nevertheless went into the streets. "People made their anxieties known and showed their sick children," Khakimova told the conference. On 8 March 1988 local women organized another demonstration in the city streets. The local authorities refused to reconsider their decision, however. The movement's activists announced in Leningrad that the inhabitants of Kirishi will not give in. They have started forging links with representatives of other cities and where similar enterprises are being established and where environmentalist groups are also emerging and a struggle is being waged against similar projects. Despite all these difficulties, Khakimova said, the inhabitants of Kirishi will continue the struggle.

A similarly radical speech was delivered by the representative of the city of Sosnovyy Bor, in Leningrad Oblast. The local inhabitants, including foresters, came out against the construction of a new rayon of luxury apartments for leaders. Pine trees 150 years old are to be felled to construct these homes. Environmentalist group activists are demanding the suspension of construction work and the allocation of the homes already completed to children, since there is a very difficult situation in the city with regard to children's facilities, with a shortage of kindergartens and nursery schools. The local authorities, however, have launched a campaign against "demagogues and instigators." The thousands of letters sent to every official body are in vain. "In our city there is also an unemployment problem," the worker Morozov, representing the Sosnovyy Bor group, complained. "We have a feeling that we will win this battle."

Listening to such speeches, the meeting became increasingly animated, but the climax came when USSR Academy of Sciences candidate member A.V. Bezyazykov, from the city of Kuybyshev, started reading from the platform a confidential official report on the status of the USSR's natural environment. An hour after his speech Bezyazykov was arrested by the militia. After public protests he was released but his report was confiscated.

For its part, the conference not only condemned the militia's action but also adopted a resolution supporting Comrade Bezyazykov's proposal to form a "green" party in the USSR. This is certainly the most radical of all the resolutions adopted hitherto at various meetings and conferences of "informal left-wing groups." However, things have a long way to go before a "green" party is established in the USSR and the Leningrad environmentalist movement itself is far from unanimous on this issue.

Just 2 days later, when I met in Leningrad with representatives of several of "Epitsentr" 's constituent groups, with the Ecological Culture Council, and the Federation of Socialist Social Clubs, it became increasingly clear to me that the social movement as a whole here is much less politicized, much less concerned with the strategic problems of perestroyka, than it is in Moscow.

One of Epitsentr's founders and leader of the "Delta" group, Petr Kozhevnikov, argued very heatedly the need to found a "green" party. "By now the issue concerns no longer the problems of mankind's survival but the problems of death," he stressed. However, when the question of methods arose—what political and social ideas and what strategy the greens should adopt—Kozhevnikov was not so definite and admitted that he had no such resolutions prepared. Sergey Tsvetkov, ecological scientist and an expert belonging to the same Delta group, spoke no less resolutely against this idea of a green party. Any party is an apparatus and entails obligatory decisions on everything and a centralized leadership. The movement's strength lies in its spontaneity, however. To this end, Tsvetkov stressed, political changes are not so important as moral regeneration and the recreation of a culture, which "is not something that the parties can do."

Zelinskaya too was very pleased with the forms and methods of the work done in Leningrad. The idea of a green party is more consistent with the Moscow organizations' line. "The movement here and in our city follows different paths. We believe that your attitude to political activity is wrong. We achieve concrete results. Now all the forces are concentrating on environmental work. When we are able to achieve concrete results in this direction perhaps more attention can be devoted to politico-cultural and socioeconomic problems."

Taking the movement as a whole, Leningrad's informals do indeed seem poles apart from Moscow's. Moscow's can discuss the history of Marxism for hours and analyze the ideas of Bakunin, Gramsci, Marcusi, or Sartre. In Leningrad all these things are of little interest. Hardly any theoretical seminars are held here and people are more satisfied with general reports on democratic socialism or an environmentally healthy society. This is why Lenigraders are better at organizing any kind of practical initiative. The groups work in an organized and rapid manner. When it came to tape recording the Baltic'88 conference one person was assigned to each group, which kept the social press office constantly occupied. Noticing this, I recalled how in Moscow at the clubs' August conference and at the informal groups' January meeting hardly any tape recordings were transcribed into typewritten accounts because of the confusion that reigned in the press office.

The political situation in Leningrad is also completely different from that in Moscow. In the capital the groups developed almost in hothouse conditions from the outset. Though even under Yeltsin the city leadership did not directly help the informal unions' development, nevertheless no obstacles were raised. From the moment of Yeltsin's fall, however, the situation has steadily deteriorated. Things were quite the opposite in Leningrad. At first everything was very difficult but then, as the movement strengthened, the situation improved and the authorities' position became increasingly liberal. To some extent it is possible to speak in terms of a healthier growth trend within the movement, less susceptible to the authorities' provocations.

It is strange that the right hardly makes its presence felt in Leningrad. The Russian nationalist organization Pamyat has no apparent influence here. Right-wing liberal dissident groups are disorganized and lack well-known and vigorous leaders, unlike in Moscow. The local branch of the antimilitarist group, Doveriye, is a long way from the Moscow organizations, which have shifted too far to the right, and is considering the possibility of changing its name (one of the proposed alternatives, the "Plekhanov Political Club," speaks for itself.)

The main ideological enemy is not always constituted by the Stalinists, very active here, as they have been throughout the country in recent months. The evidence suggests that Leningrad has become one of the centers of the Stalinist revival. Following the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's publication of the terrible article by Leningrader Andreyeva, "I Cannot Waive Principles," resolutely condemning the socialism of the left-wing liberal intelligentsia and hailing the merits of the leader of the peoples, local organizations held a meeting on 23 March in support of her principled positions.

Representatives of "left-wing" clubs were also able to participate in the discussions but in the end the meeting's organizers acted as though its participants had universally approved Andreyeva's article and the newspaper's representative said that public support confirmed that SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's decision was correct.

It is not surprising under such circumstances that the main and most precise point of disagreement for the Leningrad clubs remains their attitude toward the barrage and their assessment of Stalin. We "left-wingers" and "informals" defend the environment and democracy. They, the bureaucrats and Stalinists, defend the barrage and despotic power. Leningrad's "informal" movement can be said to be similar to Moscow's but Muscovites (perhaps because of the more complex ideological situation, competition from right-wing liberals, and the active struggle against "Pamyat") are much more interested in a positive strategic plan, have a more developed political awareness, and feel part of a worldwide left-wing movement and spirit of socialism.

Events will show which approach offers the best prospects. Taken overall, however, the Leningrad version of the movement is as unilateral as the Muscovites'. Some of the clubs' leaders acknowledge this fairly openly. "Spaseniye's" Alesieia [name as published] Valev, "Perestroyka's" Molakov, and "Forpost's" Razorenov talked about the importance of the movement's political tasks, about the need for a struggle for real legal and political guarantees of the citizens' freedoms enshrined in the constitution and for self-management of labor

collectives, and about real socialism. Moreover it is no coincidence that these three clubs belong to the Union of "informal" clubs and share the same strategic outlook as the Moscow Union.

The Muscovites' line actually emerged in practice in the campaigns for freedom of assembly conducted on Kovalev's initiative. "Spaseniye" was joined by other groups of the "informal" clubs Union both in Leningrad and in other cities. But it is right here that the struggle has developed most.

The issue is that after the 19 March 1987 demonstration outside the Angliya hotel the Moscow and Leningrad authorities issued "temporary provisions" governing the holding of rallies and demonstrations but in practice granted local leaderships the right to ban any meeting on the basis of its "objective." Apart from in the capital, these temporary regulations also came into effect in over 20 other cities including Kiev, Odessa, Riga, Tallinn, Vilnius, Novorossisk, Ufa, and so forth.

For their part, the clubs belonging to the informal organizations defined the "temporary regulations" as unconstitutional and called for their replacement with democratic legislation granting citizens the right to hold unhindered any kind of mass meeting that does not violate public order and legality and also the opportunity to appeal against the authorities' decisions in the event of a ban resulting from a refusal to grant authorization for rallies and demonstrations. Leningrad's "Perestroyka," which includes professional jurists, has announced its readiness to draft alternative regulations. However, even before the "Perestroyka" experts had drafted a final document of their own, "Spaseniye" activists went into the streets to demand complete freedom of assembly and the immediate repeal of the "temporary regulations." On 13 March Kovalev received permission for a rally in Mikhailovsk park at which he called, on the Federation's behalf, for the abolition of the anticonstitutional practice of bans. Mikhailovsk park is an inconvenient location where almost nobody goes, but nevertheless approximately 500 people attended. A list of banned initiatives was read out, which included some that were entirely innocent from the political viewpoint. Leningrad's official press described the Mikhailov park meeting as a "Sbba" [as published, possible misprint for "sabba," "witches' sabbath"] attended by "people with extremist ideas including an indefinite number of emigres" who issued "provocative slogans such as 'down with the restriction of mass meetings in schools and enterprises and of assemblies, rallies, and demonstrations and down with those who established these restrictions'" (VECHERNIY LENINGRAD 16 March 1988.) Understandably this all prompted the utmost anxiety among the "city fathers." Nevertheless it is not so easy to label Kovalev an extremist because, as the official press itself admitted, Kovalev is a "very popular man" (SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 26 March 1988.) "Spaseniye's" energetic leader did not accept it and declared that it is not the meetings but the "temporary regulations" that are provocative.

"Spaseniye" used the anniversary of the Angliya hotel demonstration to define its positions once again. This time the meeting's official organizer was Pilatov's ZTI, thanks to which the city authorities allowed the relatively large Vladimir Square to be used for the meeting.

Certainly more than a thousand people attended. The speakers talked about the city's democratic leadership and the need to conserve its old buildings. One of the houses due for demolition was adorned with a banner several meters long carrying the "Spaseniye" group's emblem. Kovalev said that the city needs a genuinely socialist municipal policy and that the regulations now governing the city "do not constitute socialism." As always, there was talk of the barrage; of the fire at the Leningrad Academy of Sciences library, which destroyed very valuable ancient books and documents; and of the "Chernobyl phenomenon."

At the end some "real provocateurs" appeared in the square. "Spaseniye" supporters carried through the crowd effigies depicting a bureaucrats' demonstration. The effigies carried placards bearing the messages: "an immediate end to perestroyka," "all power to the bosses," "all informals are paid by the CIA," or "after the barrage the deluge." Then Kovalev reappeared with a placard on his chest which read: "I spoke against the temporary regulations." The "Spaseniye" leader was asked to respond to the serious charges leveled at him, of extremism and of being a provocateur and politically irresponsible. In reply Kovalev merely asked to read out Lenin's 1913 article on "The Cadets' Bill on Meetings."

The ideas of the founder of Bolshevism sounded no less categorical than the present demands of the Federation of "informal" clubs: "At one time in the cities announcements of meetings were given in the newspapers; what is this idiotic bureaucratic requirement for a declaration?" "A law is needed whereby, at the request of a small number of citizens, any social building, school, and so forth must be made available to people, free of charge and hindrance, for meetings in the evenings and at other free times."

The proposal was put to the people who gathered in Vladimir Square that a decision be made by show of hands on the issue of the "Spaseniye" leader's guilt. "Who favors absolving Kovalev?" Hundreds of hands were raised. Everyone in the square voted. Some started shouting "Long live Lenin."

Clearly not only specific events but political campaigns too can win Leningraders' support. Especially since the draft alternative legislation on meetings, demonstrations, and assemblies drawn up by Monakov and his "Perestroyka" club companions displays a serious and responsible approach by "left-wingers" to such issues. It is just important that the socialists' political activism lead ultimately to concrete results, such as the elimination of the "temporary regulations," for instance.

I left Leningrad in a much easier frame of mind than when I arrived. At the end of my stay the sun shone and in its rays the former capital's empty streets looked attractive. Some well refurbished buildings showed what this city could become if it ever has the chance to return to its former greatness. For the present, however, the northern former capital is still struggling to preserve itself. Its historical appearance, its buildings, and its character are unlike Moscow's and so are its democratic and revolutionary traditions.

Journalist Calls for Glasnost in Drafting Laws

PM2005114088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[Aleksandr Ilin article under the rubric "From a Journalist's Notebook": "Foreword to a Dialogue"]

[Text] Premium on Smoke? [subhead]

Every smoker dreams of giving up one day. I know from experience—I have tried myself, more than once. But I will not insist that absolutely everyone has that dream. Each to his own, as the saying goes. But I am sure of one thing: People who dream of giving up smoking read particularly eagerly every possible piece of advice on how to make it easier to combat this bad, harmful habit. Both for the smoker himself, and for society as a whole.

It was in that frame of mind that I set about reading an appeal, published on Health Day, from the presidium of the All-Union Scientific Society of Cardiologists, with a commentary by Professor R.G. Oganov. I must pay tribute to our cardiologists: They demonstrate impressively both the damage done by smoking, which ruins the health of millions of people, and the measures that should have been adopted long ago to curb the "great killer." I would also like to thank the good people for their work—after all, it is a question of life and death for us....

But I cannot remain silent about something on the list of proposed measures that, to put it mildly, worried me. Let me quote this perfidious item: "Make provision for a phased increase in prices of tobacco products and use the revenue obtained for combating smoking."

What a simple idea, a premium on smoke: Let the smoker himself pay the cost of an implacable struggle against himself, that is, against smoking. It reminds me at once of a slogan popular among humorists: Saving drowning people is a matter for drowning people; and of the cunning Baron Munchhausen, who pulled himself out of a bog by his own hair....

Well, in the conditions of all-pervading economic accountability, that idea looks as if it is not without common sense. Only I remember that comparatively recently, the prices of tobacco products in our country were indeed increased, but the number of smokers has not by any means fallen since then, in fact it has even increased. And people have begun to smoke more not of the costly, top-quality cigarettes with a first-grade filter that lessens the nicotine blow, but of cheap, poor-quality, and therefore particularly harmful products.... It appears that they do not have much faith in the possibility of reeducation and are not very worried about it, if they plan to obtain dividends from a "price hike" on the pernicious habit. Perhaps there is some higher purpose in it, but all the same, counting on some kind of "cut" is, you will agree, not particularly noble. And indeed, it is frankly naive. Especially since examples already exist of where such plans lead to, of what playing with alcohol prices, for instance, leads to.

According to the USSR Ministry of Trade, in the last 3 years the sale of sugar in the country has increased sharply—the reckoning runs to hundreds of thousands of tons a year. But even without the Ministry of Trade figures, people can tell there is something wrong—in many places sugar is sold on coupons. Attempts by dishonest traders to turn the coupon system into a source of profit have also been observed. They say there have been ideas about purchases from abroad—in view of the growing appetites of foreign merchants, who do not forgive us the slightest blunder, that would cost many millions of dollars. Thus there was a boomerang effect from the steep increase in alcohol prices, which was, of course, dictated by the interests of combating drunkenness and alcoholism, but also envisaged, there is no point denying it, the recovery of some of the lost income. Somehow we do not hear about the income, but the ranks of the moonshiners are not getting any thinner, and alas, the militia is totally unable to cope with them, despite all the wiles of that service. Administrative punishments are usually powerless against economic advantage: Home-brewed poison comes much cheaper than what is sold in the stores.

Not many people question the need for a resolute offensive against alcoholics and drunkards—except those who have already drunk themselves into a stupor. But today it is worth reconsidering the tactics for the battle, again and again. In their letters to the editorial office readers insistently call for this to be done, noting that the frontal attack seems to have ground to a halt and that hopes pinned on the omnipotence of prohibition have not been justified. It is time to stop, look around, think how to regroup our forces without losing the bridgeheads we have won, and consider the mistakes that have been made.

I do not know how to rectify matters quickly, and it is not in the power of any one person—we all have to think about it and decide together. As in many other cases when a good law, a law that is correct in its essence and its purpose, begins to suffer hitches in practice. That happened at one time with the law aimed at combating unearned income—as a result of this law, especially in the initial period, it was mainly honest people who suffered, people who bring to our poor market the fruits of their labor on the garden or orchard plot or household

livestock unit.... But there were even more sacrifices when the law enforcement agents and controllers, in their zeal, overstepped the bounds of reason and ruined people's lives for the sake of their report, for the sake of another little case for their report on the work done. PRAVDA once reported a tragic case in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast where a man died, accused by zealous champions of selflessness because of an incautious act by his daughter. The father hastened to remedy the mistake and return goodness knows what sum of "unearned income," but the "fact" went down in the report, and that was that....

This kind of zeal during various campaigns "to combat..." is a very widespread phenomenon, and many more examples could be cited. But in pondering them, you come to the conclusion that the people who zealously carry out instructions, put on a show, and bungle things should not take all the blame. Although in each specific instance they should be dealt with strictly, to teach them not to do it again. All the same, the most important thing is, I think, to uncover the prime cause and soberly and critically analyze the very practice of the drafting of laws and resolutions. To see whether it is possible to forestall negative elements.

Missing the Bus [subhead]

How do all kinds of drafts, resolutions, and laws arise? How are the various programs that affect the interests of very many people drafted?

Everyone remembers the much-publicized recent debates about the multibillion project for the "great diversion" of the northern and Siberian rivers, which now, one would like to think, has fortunately sunk into oblivion. Or the equally fierce battle over yet another GES on the Daugava, whose construction was stopped by a decision of the USSR Government. Or the heated debates over the forcible introduction, into an atmosphere already oversaturated with harmful discharges in a number of cities, of more enterprises emitting "plumes of smoke"....

In recent years there have been more and more examples of the victory of common sense over departmental ambition, and that is gratifying. But it is distressing that these victories cost society too dear. Because as a rule the public misses the bus and arrives only when the draft is already prepared, when the excavators have begun to dig out trenches for the foundations of industrial blocks or the bulldozers to clear the ground for new construction work. Thus the second attempt to defend Baykal in 1966 was undertaken after the pulp plant already had a firm footing on the southern bend of the "glorious sea," when its water-consuming and water-destroying production unit was waiting for the command "go."

It is not hard to imagine why many attempts were unsuccessful. What could scientists, writers, journalists, and defenders of nature do against the onslaught of economic leaders who brought the heavy guns into the argument: Funds have been spent, huge funds—the state would not stand for it, if it had to retreat....

But the projects, even the most global projects, were given the go-ahead in the seclusion of offices, and few people knew they were already in progress. Few people knew why preference was given to this or that particular decision or project or whether alternatives had been considered.

But that is all in the past, people will say, let bygones be bygones, as the saying goes. But the saying goes on: Woe to him who forgets. And in present-day practice, the yardsticks of the past have not yet been eradicated. For instance, the future tractor giant in Yelabug is still growing and growing, although the department does not know even today where and to whom to sell tractors.... The project for a GES on the Lower Tunguska is planned for implementation, having basically caught the people of Siberia and Krasnoyarsk unawares. Will their reasonable objections be taken into account?...

Or take certain documents that are highly significant for society's life, for millions of people. It is well known that work is under way on a new procedure for paying for housing and on a price reform. Draft laws are being drawn up on young people and on informal associations. Once, from the program "Before and After Midnight," television viewers learned of the intention to draft a law on glasnost, although, as one of the people drafting it, Yu. Baturin, a staffer of the Institute of the State and Law, stated, there were doubts as to the need for such a law. Evidently a document is indeed necessary, especially if its authors attach paramount importance to concern for guarantees of glasnost, rather than limits on it.... And of course, it would be best to create a law on glasnost with the utmost glasnost, on the basis of public opinion. After all, there is a law on the nationwide discussion of the most important issues in our life, while the USSR Constitution also makes provision for another democratic form, referendums. But the form is not the point. It is more important to achieve in practice an effective interaction between the competence of experts and specialists and the strength of society's collective thought.

Idle journalists tried to penetrate the "laboratories" where certain drafts are born. But it transpired that those drafting them have their own interpretation of glasnost. It is not the time, they said, for newspapermen to poke thier noses into our business and draw the public's attention to it. The "price experts" willingly give interviews, as if they did not shun glasnost; but somehow it does not look as if the opinions of journalists and the concerns of readers and specialists seriously influence the course they have set—the pricing caravan continues on its way. Although, you will agree, it is rather odd that the launch of the "cost-cutting mechanism" presupposes a growth in prices, that is, costs....

As a rule, the drafters have one argument: We prepare our own, departmental version, it will be examined in the relevant bodies, they will decide, and then the draft will (or will not) be submitted for general discussion. And then, please, go ahead, discuss, propose, put forward amendments.... But then, you see, those informal groups demanded to be shown the outlines and started rumors that someone wants to bind them hand and foot with the law.

It happened, it happened. Rumors went around Moscow, certain particularly emotional elements even wanted to hold a demonstration in one rayon of the capital. I am not about to justify these actions of theirs, but I think it is possible to understand their concern. And especially their desire to obtain information that concerns them. Afterwards, they brought people to the rayispolkom, gave them the details, and the majority were reassured. Others wanted to submit proposals. Should we be afraid of dialogue? Let them know, let them argue, let them submit proposals—it will not do any harm. On the contrary, it might at last be possible to foresee and forestall possible errors and take the finer points into account. Rather than ending up kicking ourselves when it is too late.

We simply cannot get rid of the habit of sewing a suit without a fitting, to fit a standard figure. Instead of making the clothes fit the person, we try to make the people fit the clothes.

We Need Options [subhead]

In many years of newspaper work I have many times taken part in organizing discussions in the press of very important party and state documents. PRAVDA's editorial office usually receives many thousands of letters. Long and concise, calm and agitated. It is quite impossible to print them all—only a small proportion can be printed. In addition the editorial office prepares reviews of the most practical proposals for the relevant commissions, and other publications do the same.

There is no need to prove the usefulness of such discussions, it is obvious. And all the same, the result is, frankly, inadequate, it often boils down merely to clarifications and individual amendments, without touching on the concept itself. Yet people often propose conceptual changes, radical ideas, which do not, as a rule, meet with support or find themselves put into practice. What is the problem? It is not, of course, ill will on anyone's part, it is not that the discussions are merely formal; I believe it is because the force of public intelligence is brought in at a stage when the concept has already been formulated, the choice in principle has been made and basically approved by the relevant body, and is deemed not to be subject to review. Incidentally, this not infrequently leads to a mistake in evaluations, when objective analysis gives way to "pluses and more pluses."

I think effectiveness could be increased if the elaboration of all drafts was given a collective, competitive character from the first. If it was conducted, so to speak, on a dialogue basis.

It used to be the opinion among us that the presence of various options and a certain parallelism in the approach to resolving, say, scientific or other problems amounted to wastefulness. Only now are we beginning to understand the harmfulness of a monopoly approach, which leads to stagnation. And thereby to even greater wastefulness. The competitive approach offers the opportunity to adopt what are really the best decisions and find the most economical path to the goal.

What is meant by a "creative workshop" for large-scale projects, be they scientific and technical or social? First and foremost, no false secrecy, departmental monopoly, or authoritative "opinions" predestined to succeed. "Scenarios" are drafted and defended by as many different groups as there are alternative approaches. And these groups should include weighty representatives of all the spheres affected by the project, without exception. Let an economist, an ecologist, and so forth scratch their heads along with the designer and planner, let a sociologist, a medic, a social psychologist work on a law alongside the legal expert.... Whatever the occasion requires, in the interests of people and the cause. And only then are the "scenarios" for the project, born in disputes and debates, submitted to the judgment of specialists, independent experts or the broad public—depending on the nature and scale of the problem. As is the custom, for instance, in a competition for architectural designs. Preference is given not to the pushiness of the designers or to the body that is behind them ("Sidor Sidorych supported it!"), but to the quality of the ideas, the designs themselves. Alternative proposals will not be wasted, either—everything valuable they contain is useful in the finalization of the draft that is accepted as the basis. First and foremost for clearing its "bottlenecks," eliminating obvious and hidden shortcomings and possible negative consequences.

If matters had been organized like that, for instance, in the drafting of the law on combating unearned income, it should have been possible largely to avoid the situation where in the initial period the nets that were spread mainly caught the harmless small fry, while the big "sharks" broke through the fine but insufficiently strong net and escaped punishment. And in the antialcohol measures the main blow would have been struck against the causes of the social disease, not against those who were unable suddenly, all at once, to restructure their way of life and the whole structure of long-established customs and rituals. It would have been possible to foresee and forestall the sugar shortage, find a more effective antidote for combating moonshiners and speculators, and avoid injuring the dignity of people who do not deserve unsubstantiated accusations of addiction to alcohol.

What is preventing the expansion of democracy in the sphere of legislation? Mainly, the bureaucratic inertia of thinking. It is sometimes simply impossible to understand the strength of resistance to certain urgently needed democratic innovations. For instance, the reluctance of legal bodies to adopt the entirely reasonable proposal on giving attorneys access to the investigation before the charge is brought. An attorney is not a hindrance to a good investigator, but an assistant in the quest for truth. Their cooperation or, if you like, their confrontation within the framework of the law would help to decide people's fates more objectively and with more substantiation.

Restructuring literally blows apart social apathy and awakens creative, constructive forces in the people. Some people, let us be frank, far from rejoicing in this, are even frightened by it. They would like, if not to stop entirely the keen debates and discussions, which, incidentally, are bound to mean excesses and costs, then at least to confine them within a certain framework and scale them down to fit the usual pattern. Like in a school, where, at the mathematics inspection, the students are apparently offered options, but the strict teacher warns them at once: The right-hand row takes the first option, the left-hand row the second.... So that there is, and is not, a choice. Is that not an idyll for a bureaucrat?!

Today more and more people are becoming aware that an authoritarian approach to the diversity of life is no longer possible. It is impracticable. A dynamic quest is under way for forms and methods of real participation by the broad masses in the management of society and the drafting and implementation of collective decisions. For the real—not in words, but in practice—utilization of the creative potential of all participants in restructuring. So that everyone feels and, as it were, discovers anew the profound, binding meaning of the formula of socialist democracy, a formula that, unfortunately, has recently been eroded through thoughtless use: The state is us.

Review of Komsomol Apparatus Structure Proposed
WA18000323 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 May 88 p 2

[Article by Vitaliy Abramov, editor of the Astrakhan newspaper KOMSOMOLETS KASPIYA: "I Want To Be One of the Characters in Perestroyka"—boldface and italics as published]

[Text] It is not difficult to see that as the 19th all-union party conference approaches passions are rising and the discussions in the press and at meetings, and when people just meet, are becoming sharper. And the questions being raised are of the utmost urgency. About the authority and role of the party. About restructuring of the apparatus and cadre problems. About social and moral aspects and the life of society in this breakthrough period. And it seems at the very least strange that we, by which I mean the members of the Komsomol and the Komsomol aktiv, first and foremost the workers in the apparatus and the Communists working in the Komsomol, are standing on the sidelines and actually taking no part in the great and principled debate that the party is conducting.

Just take the problem of internal party democracy. So many opinions are being expressed while we remain silent. It is as if we have nothing to say about how to democratize in a radical way the activity of the youth league. Even though at the 20th Komsomol Congress M.S. Gorbachev had reason when he offered a rebuke for the fact that there was little discussion in the Komsomol; that it was only in the time before the congress that its life had been enriched with discussion. For discussion within the Komsomol is the main method for shaping political positions and a sense of civic duty.

That precongress discussion was somehow quickly dismissed. It ended with the congress. At the local level they probably "folded up" the best incentives. The congress, they said, has defined the directions of work, and now we must act, not talk! But even then we did not finish the debate. Many of us quickly understood that even if it were possible, it would be difficult to comply with the fine congress decisions in the old way.

The Komsomol Central Committee offers us examples of boldness, of the businesslike approach, of the antibureaucratic approach to problems. And it says: at the local level you define your own tactics yourselves. There cannot be ready-made recipes for every situation. That was the form. For the substance, open any edition of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and you immediately learn about an undertaking or some matter, large or small, that is being led by young people. The pages of the newspaper would be too small to hold the names of all the enthusiasts. But this is still a far cry from radical changes. As before, **the apparatus is formed and interacts and operates using the old ways.** This is obviously at variance with the new requirements.

This conclusion is drawn from my own observations and my personal work in the Komsomol. For even at our congress the following was stated: Sometimes the impression is created that young people are moving down one side of the street while the Komsomol activists are moving along the other. Of course, I am not writing about this in order to expose some particular apologies for activists. In my opinion, before the 19th party conference it is very important to debate the **essential nature of our Komsomol apparatus,** first and foremost the costs involved in it. I am convinced that the costs involved in the formation and functioning of the apparatus are hampering development in the youth league, and on the broader scale, the entire generation that is destined to take up the baton of perestroyka. They are also hampering me personally. This is why I would like

to examine the errors and flaws and the very existence of these very far from simple phenomena. Let me cite some examples in order to make my alarm more understandable.

This happened about 3 years ago. A certain Shulpin, the former first secretary of one of the Astrakhan raykoms, killed for personal reasons a woman who also worked in the raykom. At that time I thought "a maniac, a crazy careerist," and decided that this murder had nothing to do with the Komsomol. But time passed and you begin to realize: well, perhaps it does concern the Komsomol, because she was.... Honest Komsomol members and Communists, many of whom had previously investigated Shulpin, had tried to halt his advance first to the Komsomol and later the party "bridgeheads," but none had succeeded. This means that within our system we have no blocking device capable of stopping a person who has no moral inhibitions.

I involuntarily think of this dreadful case every time I and other members of the Komsomol Obkom Bureau are involved in cadre confirmation. How can you see how honest and principled a person is, how bold and able, by looking through several columns of figures? It is to be hoped that people come to the Komsomol with a sincere desire to help their comrades in a real way and not so as through their trust to scale first the Komsomol and then the party ladder.

They are torn with doubts. And I assure you that they are not idle doubts. When he comes into the Komsomol apparatus a person actually changes his profession. He casts aside what he has learned at the institute. Why does he do this? In order to be employed in the communist indoctrination of youth? But how does the person confirmed in a post in the Komsomol apparatus perceive the profession he mastered in the VUZ?—a mistake?; while work devoid of any professional pathway and all for indoctrination is a vocation?

When a person has talent as an organizer and when he is a youth leader these questions are removed. You can see this kind of person a mile off. This kind of person becomes a political figure without our confirmation in the Bureau. He becomes such a person not now, but in the fifth or sixth grade. But what of the others? The others, unfortunately, are oriented not on youth but on somehow pleasing the senior comrades who nominate and confirm them. And this happens everywhere, from the primary organizations to the obkom. Let me cite some examples.

Eighteen months ago our newspaper wrote about the worthless work of R. Kuramshin, secretary of the primary organization in the Caspian Nautical School. A brief account of his activity: He failed to show up in the Komsomol committee for weeks at a time and for an entire 10 months he did not pay his dues to the raykom at his own school. No one remembers him doing even the smallest amount of work. At the accountability-and-report meeting the Komsomol members evaluated Kuramshin's activity as "unsatisfactory." And what happened? The next day he started work in the Komsomol Gorkom apparatus. The nomination of a person who had fallen down on his work in a primary organization was quite to the liking of the gorkom first secretary, who, incidentally, had been in attendance at the accountability-and-report meeting.

At a recent party meeting of the obkom apparatus there was strong talk about the prospects for each of us. "What Are My Prospects?": This is the question that floats around in the Komsomol apparatus. And precisely because the worker in the apparatus is a person with a lost profession. It takes very little time for the full-time Komsomol worker to be transformed from a defender of the interest of youth into a defender of himself. He must find a place, and he looks for it, pushing everything else into second place.

One of the first secretaries in the Komsomol Kamyzyakskiy Raykom, Vladimir Zemskov, was transferred to work in the party raykom. Shortly before that the chief of the organizational department in the Komsomol Obkom had come to him to conduct a check. This trip was not happenstance: Somehow the ranks of the rayon organization had been rapidly thinned and it was hard to extract dues. And what was found out at the local level? The Komsomol members were often sincerely surprised when the obkom organizational chief asked them about Zemskov. They did not know him. The first secretary was considered to be a fellow who in fact was the second secretary. This was the picture of the Komsomol leader: Vladimir Zemskov. And so what: he was confirmed as a sector chief in a CPSU raykom.

Here, the personal destiny of an apparatchik is tied to the public interest. Now Zemskov's duties in his new post will, with seniority, be to teach Communists how to live correctly, and he will accept into the CPSU young people who know his worth. I am convinced that his promotion has struck a blow not against against the authority of the Komsomol Raykom but also the rayon party committee.

Another example. At what they call the obkom level. True, there had been several earlier "April winds." As is known, before a television broadcast a rehearsal takes place. Along with others, Petr Konovalov, at that time a Komsomol Obkom second secretary, was invited to the studio. While commenting on one of the television subjects, the anchorwoman criticized the oblast Komsomol "Searchlight." Konovalov thought for a little while, snatched the script from the anchorwoman, ripped out the page with the critical text and said: "There is no need to talk about that during the broadcast." Taken aback, the anchorwoman did not know how to respond. It was an obkom secretary that faced her. The broadcast went ahead without the critical subject.

Now Petr Konovalov is working as the chairman of the rayispolkom, and there is no sign that he has become zealous about democratization and glasnost...

In naming these three I have not gone out of my way to choose the "worst." They are just ordinary workers in the apparatus. It is simply that for them, the traditional type of promotion has been typical. The basic principle is simple, like two plus two equals four: "It is mandatory to please those higher up and not mandatory to please those lower down." When he acts in this way, the apparatchik always wins.

There is another reality just as bad. Strange as it may seem, within the apparatus we most often find not individuals who have opinions on everything but simply executors who are not stupid. So that they are dull, but not too dull. Obkom secretary Lyudmilla Fedorova told me that many smart young people have refused offers to transfer to work in the apparatus. They do not want to be "cogs in the bureaucratic machine." This means, they take what they can get....

This year, three people have occupied the desk of the sector chief for work with the vocational and technical schools. Different people, but what any of them did remains a mystery. They did not announce themselves in loud voices or with major deeds. Obviously they simply diligently carried out their assignment. This is how the executors attain manhood, first in the Komsomol and then in the party and soviet apparatuses. And we make helpless gestures: Where do we get our bureaucrats?

But can we equate the bureaucrat and the careerist? I am talking about careerism in the Komsomol and I mean the kind of activity that is directed not toward helping in the organization and indoctrination of youth but toward personal promotion.

I want very much to be precise. There is nothing wrong with self-assertion and striving for the acme of skill in any kind of activity directed toward the public interest. And can we, for example, say that Nikolay Kryzhanovskiy, the chairman of the organizational committee in the Leninskiy Rayon youth housing complex, is a careerist? Of course not. Or Aleksandr Kozodoy, the "engine" behind the creation of the youth scientific and technical creative society? Again the answer is no. And N. Sukharev and A. Nedochetov are nothing like careerists. Their not always courteous stubbornness that opens the doors of many offices has led to success: A youth ecology center has been opened in the city under the aegis of the Komsomol Obkom.

They are all full-time Komsomol workers. But given this, they are clearly distinguished from the apparatchiks. They are distinguished by the presence of some real business, and by specific goals and methods to reach them. Their affairs are of use to youth.

And what of the apparatchiks? Taken together, the honest and the not so honest, they have objectively been placed in conditions in which what is required of them is not a sense of zeal but a sense of expedition. If only because the apparatus assumes a plurality of actions, while a sense of zeal assumes concentration on one thing. The apparatus may permit itself to have a propaganda department consisting of three people, but it cannot have three directors of various interest clubs instead of the propaganda department. We prefer to have in the apparatus people "without any specified kind of employment," as one former Komsomol worker neatly put it.

Thus, the apparatchik-zealot or the apparatchik who is simply a conscientious executor? Like others, I do not know, but I do believe in reality that if he were thrice what was wanted, the apparatchik would succeed in being a zealot through labor.

I am reminded here of the first secretary of the Volsk Komsomol Gorkom, Aleksandr Kiselev. I have conversed with Kiselev. It seems to me that he intuitively foresees contradictions between the new forms and the new substance of Komsomol work, on the one hand, and the bureaucratic system of the apparatus on the other. I think that Sasha and his comrades have wrung everything they can from the method of forcibly implanting the new on the old. But if this is the way, it is only for the Kiselevs because they are Kiselevs, and there are not many people in the country people with their will and sense of purpose.

But what about the others who are reluctant to come to terms with their own essentially bureaucratic nature? What is left for them is to justify themselves and wait "for better times." Yes exactly that. Already a year has passed since the Komsomol congress, and seeing that apart from implanting good ideas on the old, obsolete scheme nothing is changing, many Komsomol workers are reaching the sad conclusion that evidently this is the kind of Komsomol that is needed today. A Komsomol of cosmetic improvements but not a revolution of renewal.

That evening when I was in the office the telephone rang. It was Komsomol Obkom first secretary Vladimir Demin. He said that the information passed on the details of a tragedy that had recently occurred should be withdrawn.

"Why?"

"That is what the party obkom advised. The opinion is that it is not worth pouring oil on the flames. The whole city is in turmoil."

"But the city is full of rumors!"

"You don't need to convince me! But you must withdraw it."

How can this be? I thought. For only an hour before Vladimir Demin and I had been saying that the information was most necessary. Simply essential! And suddenly a 180-degree turn.

Now to the essence of the matter. A vehicle carrying teenagers had overturned on some agricultural workings. Several people had been killed. We wanted to tell our readers the details of this accident. Rumors were circulating in the city, making the numbers of victims to be four times the actual number. The first secretary was perfectly well aware of this but he was unwilling to take responsibility himself for publishing, and he rushed off to get consent. He was unable to defend his own viewpoint.... And so down along the chain I received news of the ban. I received the instructions and also capitulated to authority.

I do not know how it was for Demin, but for me this was a serious lesson. After that no comment was ever removed from the newspaper. But I was nevertheless justified here. I have convinced myself that I am OK. And I should also have been "OK" that evening when we were laying out for print the information about the tragedy.

Probably Vladimir Korolev, the first secretary of the Privolskiy Komsomol Raykom, also has his justification. A year ago the son of the party raykom first secretary was on a trip to the "Artek" in his rayon. It was a free trip, a summer session—what a coincidence. Korolev says: "Take a look at the documents. They are in order." The documents may have been in order but it is difficult to believe in the coincidence. Already too [word illegible] compared with his comrades at school—the children of simple kolkhoz farmers and employees—it just turns out be the son of the first secretary...

So what is going on? Why in most people who come to work in the Komsomol apparatus do honesty and a sense of principle ultimately start to grow a thick skin and diminish with each new compromise? Why does each iron hand shake out our boldness and our sense of our own worth?

Some of our Komsomol workers are inclined to see the root of all evil in the personality of the first secretary. He is not sufficiently democratic, they say. Or they say that he is too oriented on opinions "from above." But if we leave aside mutual ambitions, then it is easy to see that this is not the only cause. The cause lies in our dependence and the dependence of our destinies, one and all, on that very opinion from above.

Apparatchiks "bow" to the first secretary without understanding the main thing, namely, that he manifests what up to now has been hidden in the instructor. Let me talk about the first secretary in more detail. First of all, we do not actually elect him. By voting at a plenum we are simply agreeing with the opinion of the obkom. Even less do we discuss his nomination as one among other candidates. And the newly confirmed first secretary senses that he has not been elected but named, with all the consequences stemming from this. He takes little account of opinions "from below" if the opinion "from above" is at variance with them. We once convened a meeting of the Komsomol aktiv to pose the youth just one single question: Is it worthwhile for the newspaper to publish weekly? The answer was unanimous: yes. The notes on that meeting reflected accurately the opinion that had been expressed. But subsequently the first secretary considered this opinion to be a "working opinion," and not for publication, so to speak. Why? Because the possibility existed of a very high but different opinion. Taking this possibility into account, the first secretary did not bother to hide his emotions as he expressed indignation over the fact that the opinion of the group of Komsomol members had been published.

It is not fortuitous that I say "first secretary" rather than "Vladimir Demin." I am sure that any person appointed from above would behave in about the same way. So the essence of the matter lies not with Demin but with his post. And in the fact that we ourselves develop or thwart democracy within the Komsomol.

"How can this be!" Demin is outraged. "I work tirelessly, I talk from morning till night on the telephone with various leaders. All for the Komsomol members, not for myself!"

In fact our secretaries usually do work hard. But where is the result? For the past 3 years not one single youth club has been organized in the city. Even the rock-and-roll clubs that now thunder out across the entire country; here it has virtually collapsed. For 3 years not one single stadium has been built in the city. Not one student theater or any other creative youth collective has obtained premises with help from the Komsomol. You can work round the clock but this no justification for zero results.

Of course, it is not only obedient executors with an eye on further promotion who turn up in the apparatus. Many honest young men and women go in for full-time Komsomol work. At first they try to examine and then resolve how to deal with an apparatus that is rusted from within. But how many of them become exhausted with the mechanism of subordination and servility!

The following is a graphic example. Elmira Zhade has been working in the organizational department of a obkom for a year. More than one department chief has been convinced of her incompetence and lack of initiative. The new chief of the organizational department Pavel Kuryanov raised strongly the question of her suitability for the post she occupied. But uncompromising as he is, even in the time of democratization and glasnost he has been forced to make a compromise. The negligent colleague had to be left in place. All that was needed was a couple of telephone calls from the party obkom....

Here is another justification: the style of party leadership over the Komsomol here in the oblast. The following is a typical situation: about 30 party and economic leaders were invited to the Third Komsomol Obkom Plenum; two came. And no one sounded the alarm. Why?

Unfortunately the only way to deal with the cost of apparatus work is still to leave. Without any kind of promotion or advance there. Just go back to where you came from. While it remains the only thing there is, we can expect no enhancement in the authority of the Komsomol among rank-and-file members of the Komsomol.

For along time we were lacking an obkom secretary to oversee questions of ideology. Various candidates were nominated with agreement "from above" but something was always not right with the questionnaire; for one it is his age, for another his party commitment, for a third his family situation. Finally everything came together. And so? An honest young man, a sympathetic person, took up the post. But he lacks knowledge and strength of will, and perhaps other things.... Everyone can see this. Some smile, other sympathize with him. It is obvious that he is trying, how nervous he is about not succeeding. How can he be helped now? His forms looked fine, but he is not a leader, a guide.

For a long time in our obkom the Bureau meetings have been regarded as some kind of quitrent that you pay to get the weight off your shoulders. Perestroyka is taking place in the country and during its course there is a re-thinking of the role and importance of cadres, and they are being replaced. But our Bureau has not removed a single Komsomol Raykom secretary. "He is out for blood"; that is what they say about me. No, it has nothing to do with blood. It is the capability of the Komsomol organ, which right now can be expressed in three words: sitting, talking, and leaving.

We do not hold meetings just in the obkom. We also hold out-of-town meetings. We have a new form: the out-of-town Bureau. Last year, for example, we traveled to Kharabali. It is 2 hours or more from Astrakhan by car. I recently asked the first secretary of the Kharabali Komsomol Raykom first secretary Sergey Mamtsev whether these out-of-town meetings were of any use. "No," he replied. "You just drive out the villages to have a look at the young people."

These are the kind of bureaucrats that we are; we must take the entire Bureau out to meet with the Komsomol members, and drive a whole cavalcade of cars out to the rayon.

But now the work day has ended. Today there is a party meeting. It would be better not to attend so as to avoid seeing some tremendous event—the next person to get his party card.... A fine young man was recently accepted as a candidate member of the CPSU. I think that he will bring honor neither to those recommending him nor to the organization that confirmed him as a member of the CPSU. The affair had got as far as the vote when suddenly it unexpectedly became known that an application requesting the admission of several more people had been submitted by that time. However, only his nomination was raised at the discussions at the party meeting. Why precisely him? We made something of a hash of our explanation. But it was not even worth doing it; everyone knew why: In our department only the modest total of one is admitted each year. Then the rumors started. This is how the line is formed for admission to the party. The line, which, however, has always been disrupted at the will of one person. The first secretary. Ultimately it is on his opinion that this advance depends. And this happens for one simple reason: The obkom must accept "cadres" into the party. That is, people who have prospects for climbing up the professional ladder.

Check it out, I know what I am saying. I know it myself from my turn. Or more accurately, from the displacement of that turn. I have considered myself a communist for a long time, I am deeply convinced about the ideas of perestroyka, and I had long dreamed of being admitted to the CPSU. Communists in the obkom and in the editorial offices knew all this. But the "admission vortex" whirled about me only when it was necessary to have a solid reserve of replacements for the post of newspaper editor. It was then that my candidature was accepted....

By why this shuffling of young people, the absolute majority of whom are honest people? Why is it that we are pressed into the Komsomol but cannot break into the party even with complete candor? Why these limits? For they stand on their heads and pervert the young souls and introduce an unhealthy element of competition into a comradely environment.

Is it that the party does not even trust itself?

I was recently talking about the functional competence of the Komsomol with an obkom colleague, Andrey Kopylov. Eventually the conversation turned to personalities and I asked him what useful things he had been able to achieve during the past year. He answered candidly: "I have done one thing. I arranged work for a young girl."

Just one thing out of all those accountability reports and certificates. A really good thing. But not very much? Of course not very much. But take my word for it, not every worker in the obkom can make the same boast. And so against this general background Andrey seems not too bad. This kind of level of functional competence brings me to the thoughts that I want to set forth below.

Working as a Komsomol journalist it seems to me that I have also understood better and in greater depth the tasks and opportunities of our youth league. And I categorically disagree with the opinions that hold that the youth league is outdated and that instead of it or regardless of it it is necessary to set up other youth

organizations. I think that if a real perestroyka takes place in the Komsomol and not just a cleaning of the facade, as is being done now, then the funereal attitudes themselves will disappear. And so it is dangerous to slow down perestroyka. I also have specific proposals.

I have often thought about why we copy the party apparatuses. They in no way coincide with our functions. Why must the structure of the apparatus match so absolutely? What if the obkom apparatuses were abolished? We have a central committee apparatus and apparatuses for the raykoms. Let Komsomol strategy move straight into tactics.

Even now, most serious raykom issues are resolved essentially through the central committee. I was recently in Moscow. I met with the second secretary of our Krasnoyarsk raykom, Veleriy Prokopenko. He had traveled in to the central committee to arrange the organization of a water sports center in their rayon.... And even when a Komsomol obkom does go to the Central Committee, what it most often does is "move" initiatives proposed by the raykoms and gorkoms.

Life long ago gave the hint about the most efficient form of Komsomol interaction: An idea is born in the primary organization and generalized and formulated in the raykom and resolved there. If it is not possible to resolve an issue at the local level then let the obkom Secretariat take it up, and if necessary, include the Central Committee.

If the obkom does not assume the functions of the raykoms, as it did with us in the matter of the rock-and-roll club, only three functions remain for it, namely, to account to the Central Committee, to receive reports from the raykoms and to organize training for the Komsomol aktiv. Given good coordination, the raykom elements cope quite successfully with the range of mass measures.

Instead of the obkom apparatus let there be only a Secretariat with very truncated organizational and financial-and-economic departments. Then the obkom secretaries can be transformed from being masters-of-ceremonies at weddings at their offices into true coordinators for youth initiatives. They will have to leave their command offices and armchairs and "go out among the people."

During the time that we are not engaged in our primary work we shall act according to a plan drawn up by us and approved by the Bureau. And so that painful issues do not have to be resolved during the evening, it would be possible to establish a duty day once a month for each member of the obkom in his own department. Along the same lines as consultation hours for deputies. So that members of the obkom will be working in the building everyday rather than a fully empowered apparatus.

The obkom would be transformed from a bureaucratic office into a real organization capable of great things. Then the Bureau would discuss not planning matters (read plans scheduled for half a year) but immediate issues. Organizations that in fact begin to move things from dead center.

Yes, and the raykoms would be transformed from being intermediate organs accountable in every way to the obkom along with the primary organizations, into the main wing of the Komsomol, capable of both making decisions and acting. Those informal leaders who fear servility like fire and who therefore now shun the apparatchiks, would be drawn into the raykoms.

There is more. After "abolishing" the obkom apparatus we shall bring the aktiv closer to the main mass of Komsomol members even in terms of age. The people working in the apparatus are now aged about 30. And the main mass of Komsomol members? About 20. These are quite different generations, with different interests and aspirations, and ultimately with different emotional attitudes. I say nothing of the following contradiction: 30-year-old apparatchiks have social responsibilities—family and their own young children. But for 20-year-olds most of their activities take place precisely during the evening when the apparatchiks are reading story books to their children.

I am by no means suggesting that other Komsomol workers have no better ideas or better proposals from the standpoint of how well they have been considered. I would be happy to know about them, anywhere. I am the first to express myself because I think that we must hurry. We must hurry for the sake of the Komsomol and for the sake of the 20th congress decisions. Let us argue! It is only through discussion about democracy within the Komsomol and the balance of power among the apparatuses and their tasks that it is possible to rescue our enormous organization from total bureaucratization, and for each of us to define his own true place in it.

Stalin's Record as Strategist Criticized

PM2005133188 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 May 88 p 3

[Article by Prof A. Mertsalov, doctor of historical sciences, leading scientific staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences, and participant in the Great Patriotic War: "The Myth of the Great Strategist"]

[Text] Moscow—I was sure that an article like "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Nature of Thought and Action" would appear, as the changes that have begun in our society are irreversible. It is impossible to return to the administrative edict and bureaucratic methods of management and to apologias for I.V. Stalin's role.

However, the letters from Stalin's defenders are no accident. There is still a strong oral tradition. Those among Stalin's contemporaries who benefited from his personality cult continue to influence public opinion. The mind's ability to forget everything negative and the nostalgia of those veterans who were young men during the war are also operating. Historical literature about the war, in which a triumphal style predominates, also bears great responsibility. Here the legitimate pride of the victors has degenerated into dangerous self-satisfaction and a false idealization on the part of dull-witted propagandists. It was linked to the false idealization that was condemned by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum. In conditions of inadequate democracy and glasnost, scientific personnel and writers of memoirs were silent about many pressing problems concerning the history of the war. Some historians do not want a restructuring of knowledge about the war. Their authoritarian thinking and poor professional training have taken their toll. They greet any attempt to fill the gaps in the coverage of the past with blatant hostility.

I would like to voice certain thoughts about this.

The role of a particular individual in the fight for victory cannot be equated with the victory itself. The sacred nature of the victory does not make everyone involved in it sacred. We cannot pass judgment on an individual's role by confining oneself to Victory Day or the victory parade in June 1945. The entire conflict, as well as its immediate prehistory, must be taken as a whole.

No honest researcher, including those from abroad, doubts the worldwide historic significance of the victory. Civilization on earth was threatened by the terrible danger of fascism. The coalition of states and peoples ensured its destruction, but the Soviet people played the major role. We had to endure the most cruel ordeals. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, in conditions of the personality cult, our people struggled one-on-one against the fascist bloc in 1941-1944 and later with the active participation of our allies. I make an emphatic distinction between the personality cult and the centralization of leadership, which was indeed necessary under those circumstances. The people and party were victorious despite the cult, and in its very face. This fact places still further emphasis on the magnitude of the victory.

Historical facts cast doubts not only on Stalin's greatness, but also on his political and strategic readiness.

If you look at the history, it must be said that from the end of 1924, in a sharp deviation from Lenin's political course, Stalin began to identify fascism, pacifism, and social democracy. This contradicted the interests of the working class and, essentially, the interests of all mankind. Stalin's line seriously damaged the activity of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), foreign communist parties, and the Comintern. It also hurt Soviet foreign policy. It was impossible to prevent the war, and the USSR entered it without a single ally. Naturally, other factors were also at work here, but the split between the workers movement and other democratic movements was the major one.

Stalin was to blame for the tremendous damage done to Red Army command cadres immediately before the war. Believing that the Red Army had become a "colossus without a head," the enemy expedited its attack on the USSR. Characteristically, the leading Red Army figures who were repressed included those very individuals who upheld progressive views and said the Army, Air Force, and Navy should be supplied with the latest combat equipment very quickly. The repressions inevitably reinforced the commanders' habit of "sensitively heeding the opinion of the leadership" and fettered initiative, without which successful military operations are unthinkable. To some extent, the Army managed to make up for these losses. However, they could not fail to affect its combat capability, especially in the first months of the war. In 1941-1945, a glorious new school of military commanders emerged whose history has yet to be written.

A fatal action by Stalin and his advisers was their gross error of judgment regarding the enemy's intentions on the eve of 22 June 1941. Many of Stalin's actual views or those attributed to him by individual writers prove mistaken on closer examination. It was naive to place one's hopes on Germany's pledges under the pact of 23 August 1939.

On many occasions between 1938 and 1941, the fascists had demonstrated their complete disregard for legal and moral norms. I would remind you of just one point: the seizure of the remaining Czech lands, which violated the Munich agreement Germany had just signed.

Stalin did not want to give the fascists an "excuse" to break the nonaggression pact. But had the lack of an excuse stopped them before? Hadn't they themselves fabricated excuses for their attacks on Poland and other European countries? The efforts "not to give them an excuse" did not prevent the fascists from making up a lie about the "preemptive nature" of their offensive against the USSR.

On the other hand, if it was certain that the fascists would not attack in 1941, what difference could an excuse have made? Stalin was also alarmed by the Red Army's lack of preparedness. But is there a single case in military history in which an army has been 100-percent prepared? Was it possible to hope for excellent preparations during a few years of completely unguaranteed peace and refuse to immediately place border districts in a state of satisfactory readiness? I recall our party's conclusion early this century that imperialists do not

declare wars, but begin them suddenly. This idea was reflected in our army regulations and had been theoretically formulated in the works of Soviet military theoreticians on the basis of the experience of the Wehrmacht's aggressive campaigns of 1939-1941.

Nor can the reference to a possible unfavorable reaction from the Western powers to a mobilization of the western military districts be accepted as an "excuse." Suppose this had provoked another wave of anti-Soviet propaganda. The long-term interests of those powers would have gained the upper hand very soon.

People write that Stalin hoped Germany would not attack the USSR until it had routed Britain. But he should have taken account of the fact that the situation was sharply different from that of 1914-1918. In 1941, the fascists, not without reason, considered Britain quite harmless and began their e stern campaign. Stalin may have hoped that Germany would go first to the Near and Middle East to obtain fuel supplies. However, the fascists based all their calculations exclusively on the doctrine of blitzkrieg, and considered their next campaign to be fully provisioned.

The reader has a right to ask whether Stalin had this information. The available information was more than enough to fulfill an elementary requirement —constant combat readiness in the face of an aggressive and dangerous enemy. It is immoral to hide the fact that the element of surprise arises not only as a result of an aggressor's professionalism and baseness, but also through the fault of the defender. Red Army troops were not placed in immediate combat readiness. The attack was a surprise, and this tremendously reinforced the enemy's position. This is the main, if not the only, reason for the defeats at the beginning of the war.

In the summer and fall of 1941, the Red Army was on the edge of the abyss. Millions of career servicemen—the foundation of the Army and Air Force—had died on the battlefields, and the enemy had captured vast amounts of arms. The same thing happened in 1942. Stalin's system, that is, a lack of collegiality, combined with despotism, arbitrary rule, and incompetence, adversely affected the course of the war to its very end. Criminal miscalculations—in terms of their nature and scale—spurred Stalin on to his usual practice of further atrocities, dishonest excuses, and self-glorification. In 1941 the Western Front First Command was the scapegoat. New miscalculations provoked the notorious Order No 227 of 28 July 1942. This time Stalin essentially accused all commanders and soldiers of "indiscipline."

The arguments that "history allotted us little time" and "our peace-loving country could not have made greater efforts in the interests of strengthening defense" have no real foundation. "In our allotted time" we could done much more—both in the military economy and directly in the Armed Forces. We could have done so had we not permitted miscalculation and complacency, and had we followed the recommendations of progressive academics, and not those of honored pseudoprofessionals. The main point is that in terms of all its basic characteristics, despite the aforementioned negative phenomena, the Red Army was in no way inferior to the German Army. On the contrary, one cannot dispute the fact that it had tremendous advantages in the ideological-political and moral spheres and the advantages of being the defending side.

A number of writers talk about the Wehrmacht's edge in combat experience. Superficially that is true. However, a false interpretation of the experience it had really acquired led the Wehrmacht to grossly overestimate its own capabilities and ultimately led to its downfall. The extent to which the Red Army used the experience of contemporary warfare depended largely on subjective rather than objective conditions. The thesis that during its attack on the USSR the Wehrmacht relied on the military-economic potential of all the countries that Germany had seized or that were dependent on it cannot be supported by serious scientific research. In fact, in June 1941, the Wehrmacht was making negligible use of some of the resources of those countries. Even when Germany enlisted a greater proportion of these resources, it nevertheless began to lag hopelessly behind the USSR in the military-economic context.

One-track thinking did not allow Stalin to grasp all the elements of the complex military-political situation in the world at the time.

In view of the violation of Lenin's principle of collective leadership, other political and military leaders were often unable to direct events along the proper path. The mistaken assessment of the enemy's intentions in summer 1942, for instance, had grave consequences. The Red Army was forced to retreat to the Volga and the Caucasus Mountains...

You sometimes hear ridiculous claims that it was not a victory for us at all, as it was won at the cost of such great bloodshed. You cannot alter or abolish the past, although the price of victory was incredible.

A strategist is always rated on his ability to win with little bloodshed. It is no accident that the term "Pyrrhic victory" has been used pejoratively over the centuries. Preservation of life is not merely a moral task. A nation's greatest asset is its people. Stalin's false prestige as the "great commander" still endures largely because the total losses of the USSR and Germany—the main enemies in the hostile coalitions (20 and 6 million)—have yet to be explained. Nor has another major point—information about the Red Army's irrevocable losses (10 million) and those of the Wehrmacht (2.8 million). The press also cites other data. This has a direct bearing on military professionalism. Substantial reservations must be made. Many of Stalin's authoritarian decisions effectively helped the enemy. This applies to his decision to

ban placing troops in a state of immediate combat readiness on the eve of 22 June 1941 and the continuation of the 1942 offensive without supplies, and so on.

Some people take the figure of 20 million dead as a fact without considering whether any other outcome was possible. Others generally categorically deny any historical alternatives. The question of the effect—direct or indirect— of these unwarranted losses on the country's subsequent development has not been studied. I will point out, in particular: Surely the slogans "the plan at any price" and "victory at any price" have a common methodological basis. How long can we continue to follow the harmful principle that "victors are not to be judged" without realizing that this principle could only have arisen at a time when the rudiments of general human morality and law did not exist and when people had still not learned to correlate ends and the means necessary to achieve them?

The Soviet people had to fight against not only an external enemy but also an internal one—the Stalinist system and its propagators. Just as the Stalinist system with its gross distortions of socialism must be distinguished from Marxism-Leninism, so must the heroic actions of Soviet patriots at the front and in the rear be distinguished from the distortions.

As the PRAVDA editorial stressed, the past is vitally necessary for the present in order to resolve the tasks of restructuring. If we are looking at our history with a critical eye today, it is only because we want to have a better and fuller idea of the ways ahead.

Gorbachev Speeches, Articles Published

LD2305202188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 May 88

[Excerpts] The fifth volume of selected speeches and articles by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has been published. The documents cover a period of time which was relatively short, but saturated with many significant events—from April to December 1987—and touch on a wide specter of topical issues of home and international policies. [passage omitted]

The book is published by "Politizdat."

Economic

Supreme Soviet Cooperatives Debate Reported

PM2405100988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by A. Protsenko: "Draft Approved; Permanent Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Chambers Have Approved the Draft Law 'On Cooperatives in the USSR'"]

[Text] The concluding joint sitting of the commissions for the agro-industrial complex and the commissions for legislative proposals of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities held on the eve of the session was marked by a notable event: After stormy debate the deputies proposed to exclude in full any mention of the state order from Article 31, which defines the features of the economic mechanism on kolkhozes and in other agricultural cooperatives.

Let us recall that immediately after the draft of the new law had been published in the press, newspaper editorial offices were flooded with letters criticizing this particular article. "The state order brought to the kolkhozes in one form or another will become the same thing as a plan, fettering the kolkhoz members' initiative, a kind of latter-day 'requisitioning,'" the letters' authors asserted. The relevant proposals were sent to the working group working on the final version of the draft law. As a result the text of the article was somewhat altered, formulas were relaxed, and it was emphasized that kolkhoz members may conclude contracts for the sale of agricultural output through a state order on a voluntary basis. But the overwhelming majority of members of the joint deputies' preparatory commission which took part in completing the draft at the final stage did not agree even with this formulation. The question was submitted for discussion by the permanent commissions.

"We believe that it is not necessary to include even the actual words 'state order' in Article 31," deputy V. Zabolotnyy, chairman of a kolkhoz in Voronezh Oblast, said at the sitting. "Even the improved formulation will be interpreted in different ways locally. The voluntary state order will ultimately be turned into the state command."

"Leaving Article 31 even in the form which it has now acquired means opening the way to an approach to planning that is based on administration and command," Deputy V. Popov, a kolkhoz chairman from Volgograd Oblast, said. "Our destiny is being decided in this law. Unless we break this approach today, in the period of restructuring, it will be very difficult to fight bureaucracy in the future."

The results of the discussion were summed up by deputy A. Ponomarev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission for the Agro-Industrial Complex. "The comments are fundamental ones and a decision must be taken," he said. "A decision which would allow no zealous administrator to take command of a kolkhoz, preventing the consolidation of the economy and the development of the peasant farm's autonomy."

A draft law in which the mention of the state order has been removed from the first paragraph of point 2, Article 31, is being submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

The completed text of the draft law also contains many other changes. For instance, a new formulation of the article on price formation seeks to defend the interests of the customer. Additions have been made to the article on

taxation. In accordance with these changes cooperative farm members are not threatened with a progressive tax on personal income if they sell their output (work, services) at centrally set prices (rates, job prices).

As a whole, all participants in the sitting noted, the new law is of a truly revolutionary nature and it gives us the broadest opportunities for the accelerated development of the socialist economy, the solution of the food and housing problems, and the satisfaction of people's requirements for goods and services.

The draft of the new law has been approved. Now we await the session.

Vasilenko on Debate

LD2205041488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 May 88

[Passages within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] As you know, comrades, another USSR Supreme Soviet session will open on 24 May in the Kremlin. The Draft Law on Cooperatives is among the issues to be submitted to the session. A joint session of the Agro-Industrial Commissions and the Legislative Proposals Commissions of the Supreme Soviet Chambers was devoted today to preliminary discussion of the document. Our correspondent Olga Vasilenko attended the session and here is her report:

[Vasilenko] Perhaps everybody knows that the Draft Law on Cooperatives was published in early March for nationwide discussion. Since then over 200,000 proposals have been received by the USSR Supreme Soviet, newspapers, and the radio. They say, in particular, that an effective legal mechanism for protecting the cooperatives' interests against unlawful decisions and actions of various bodies should be worked out. There have been many proposals on price formation, taxation, and on the membership and the sphere of cooperative activity. It is precisely on the basis of these proposals that 22 articles have been modified and 44 supplemented in the draft law. Thus, today the deputies discussed a draft law which had already been amended. The debates, however, were very heated. Let us listen to what deputies were talking about; for example, Popov, chairman of a kolkhoz in Volgograd.

[Popov] "We have clever people everywhere, both at the top and at the bottom, and everyone is trying to find a way to twist the issue in his own manner. Paragraph 31 is precisely one of those which provides opportunities for solving problems at your own discretion. We must not let it happen. In fact, things remains as they have always been. How do we conclude contracts now? The person with whom we are concluding a contract comes, be it an industrialist, or an inspector, and presents us with figures that have been drawn up in advance. We are categorically against such orders. There should be offers from the sovkhoz, otherwise the diktat of the higher organs will continue."

[Vasilenko] I can clarify that the point in question is the article of the draft law related to the state order. Here is another issue which provoked a wide-ranging debate, that of cooperatives. Yuriy Mikhaylovich Luzhkov, first deputy chairman of the Moscow Ispolkom, who had devoted great deal of time and energy to the cause of promoting cooperatives, spoke about this.

[Luzhkov] "Not all, and certainly not the guarantor enterprises, go in for setting up cooperatives. When cooperatives were first set up, guarantors were more forthcoming in organizing cooperatives under their auspices, but then they very quickly realized that they were creating competitors for themselves which not only win the consumer over but also expose negative sides in the work of the enterprise itself. After that, cases started to emerge when guarantor enterprises began to abandon the cooperatives they had set up. In their letters many Muscovites show their unhappiness about the prices of production and the quality of goods and services. The prices of output and services provided by public catering cooperatives provoke a particularly painful reaction. Demand will exceed supply until we set up a broad network of cooperatives. This may result in continuous arbitrariness in price formation. By the way, so far the law has given no answer to this acute question."

[Vasilenko] Problems have been posed, as you can see. Deputies asked Gostev, USSR finance minister, to answer some of them. Here is an excerpt from his speech:

[Gostev] "We cannot, perhaps, view the subject from the standpoint of personal or collective interests alone. First of all, each Soviet citizen has to think primarily about strengthening the might of the state. Specifically, when taxation of cooperatives was discussed, it was based on the same principle too. In principle, though, we think—speaking about the law that we are going to adopt—that we should perhaps look into taxing cooperatives. I think, comrades, that emotional reorts in the press are not perhaps needed. Excuse me, I may be a poor specialist in arts, but I understand that Comrade Ulyanov [prominent actor and proponent of restructuring] is a good actor yet he is hardly a specialist in economics and finance. When he starts speaking about taxes, in my view, he is not competent enough in this area."

[Announcer] As you can see, both we journalists and Mikhail Aleksandrovich Ulyanov got what was coming. I will note that, in my view, the degree to which the minister is interested in the matter is very different from that displayed in the deputies' speeches. I will add that the deputies suggested that the law go into effect—provided it is adopted by the session—as of 1 July. But this is for the session to decide.

Republics Report Plan Fulfillment Statistics
LD1905190788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 19 May 88

[Text] In reports by the union republic state committees for statistics on the 1st-quarter results in implementing the republican economic and social development plans, it is noted that since the beginning of 1988 the working people of our country have insured the further growth of social production and an increase in public well-being.

The enactment of the USSR Law on State Enterprises (Associations) and the transfer of many of these to full financial autonomy and self-financing have created the conditions for developing independence, raising responsibility for the results of their activity, and have activated the work of labor collectives.

During the 1st quarter, Lithuanian industry fulfilled its contract obligations for the delivery of products by 99.9 percent. The production of consumer goods increased by 6 percent compared to the same period last year. National income in Moldavia rose by 4.6 percent compared to the corresponding period last year. What is more, the growth was achieved as a result of an increase in labor productivity. In the Latvian SSR, the manufacture of industrial production increased by 7.4 percent. In Kirghizia, more meat, milk, and eggs were produced by sovkhozes and kolkhozes than in the 1st quarter of last year. National income in Tajikistan rose in the 1st quarter by more than 6 percent in contrast to January-March of last year. However, public demands for meat and milk products is not being satisfied. In Armenia, industrial output rose by R82 million. However, according to a number of indicators, a lag has been permitted in the implementation of plan tasks. In the Turkmen SSR, economic profits grew by 8.7 percent. The Agricultural and Industrial Committee has coped with the 1st-quarter targets for the production of most kinds of products. The sowing of alfalfa and cotton is being completed in the republic.

In Estonia, plan targets for industrial production, major construction, transportation, and retail trade turnover have been fulfilled. At the same time, meat production has decreased in almost all regions and the procurement of early vegetables has dropped.

Abalkin on Economic Model's Applicability
AU2105144988 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 17 May 88 p 6

[Article by Academician Leonid Abalkin, director of the Economics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Is There an Economic Model Analogous With the Soviet One?"]

[Text] Some time ago I had a talk with members of an American delegation that was headed by a high-level official of the U.S. State Department. When I concluded an hour's discourse about our reform and about restructuring, I was asked: "It will thus be about the same as in Yugoslavia, will it not?" I tried to explain that it would not be the same and that, in many respects, it would be quite different. But they did not understand me. Who knows why the Americans stubbornly compare the Soviet economic model that we want to introduce before the beginning of the nineties with some already existing analogy?

Often it is being compared with the model of a Western-type market economy. On the basis of such a comparison it is then being assessed to what extent the Soviet Union has progressed in the implementation of its plans. We, however, are not heading toward that model and do not want to emulate it. Our model is more complicated than that. It is the model of a socialist, plan-based economy.

We will deal with the problem of balance between prices and revenues of the population and with the problem of equilibrium between supply and demand on the market not only by means of prices and taxes, but also by means of direct planned guidance of the proportions of national economic development.

On the other hand I would like to stress that what is at stake today is a very profound economic reform of a genuinely revolutionary nature. We intend to revise in principle the existing mechanism of management and to create a new mechanism, one based on socialist tenets, ideals, and goals, on socialist norms that we consider to be consistent with and adequate to socialism.

This raises the question of how to assess the existing model. If this model is socialist, why does it have to be changed and, if it has to be changed, what is its nature? An answer to this question is tied up with the fact that in the past we bore witness, and still bear witness today, to grievous deformations of socialist principles in our economic life and in the system of management methods. The purpose of the reform is to eliminate these deformations and create the scope for the potentials and advantages that our system offers.

We are sometimes being asked whether the restructuring of economic management would be necessary, had the aforesaid deformations and grievous negative manifestations of the seventies and early eighties not occurred; whether restructuring is a coincidence, conditional on historical deviations from our path, deviations that did not have to occur, or whether it is something law-governed and inevitable.

I lean toward the second answer because I believe restructuring is inevitable in any case. The economy has undergone changes of principle since the time when the existing system of management took shape—regarding technology, in its size, in its social aspects, as well as from the viewpoint of the character of people who are

involved in this process. Had there been no deformations, restructuring would naturally take a different form, would be implemented by different methods and, probably, also at a different pace. It would have perhaps been easier.

Many of the root causes of restructuring lie in internal conditions, but not only there. There is a group of causes that have certain law-governed, international features. That is why we say that it is not in our country alone that the time has become ripe for restructuring.

Very many questions of experts and foreign visitors concern the development of cooperatives and individual labor activity.

The development of these forms of economic activity is, indeed, a major step ahead in the understanding of the essence of socialist ownership. We now understand that we must widen the forms of ownership and permit their diversity. We see that a more economical attitude to property and production is making itself felt in the cooperative and individual sectors. Members of cooperatives and individually working persons put every hour of their working time, each unit of their output, and all of their tools to economical use. That must be supported.

However, problems, too, rise to the surface in this regard. For instance, by means of taxes and other forms of social control it is necessary to regulate possible [inordinate] differentials in incomes, differentials that are unwarranted in the social sense. These are relatively simple problems, however. The question of cooperative and individual labor activity is neither the most difficult nor the most important question regarding ownership.

The most important problem that we have encountered in the process of restructuring is the question of how to achieve, in the conditions of the preservation of state and socialist ownership as the chief form of ownership, that production is flexible, that it swiftly respond to advances in science and technology, that it change in accordance with the continuously changing and continuously new requirements of society.

In other words, how to achieve that also in enterprises operating on the basis of state ownership people display the same economical and attentive attitude to production [as in privately owned enterprises], how to achieve that they do not feel like temporary or hired labor but like the masters of property?

We have not managed to achieve this yet. State ownership is still unable to swiftly change its orientation, to introduce new technology and put it to efficient use. The question arises: Will it ever be able to do that? If so, what needs to be done for it to be able to do that? The ongoing search in the sphere of full-fledged economic accountability, self-financing, self-management, and election of top executives is therefore not just the search for a reply to the question of how to raise efficiency by 2 or 3 percent, but it is a search for replies to questions that are raised by history and the present era. These are questions, to which we must find the answers and thereby prove, or deny, the ability of socialism to safeguard progress, both economic and social.

Wage Delays 'Discredit' Restructuring

PM2305135188 Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 May 88 p 2

[Article by special correspondent N. Mokrishchev under the "Conflict" rubric: "Pay Day But No Money..."—boldface as published]

[Text] N. Dubovik, senior furnace worker at Zhdanov's Ilich Metallurgical Combine, telephoned the TRUD correspondent's office:

"Why is there no money for wages? Our combine switched to working on an economically accountable basis 1 January. We are meeting our delivery and sales targets. We have made a profit. But when payday comes, we are told: You'll have to wait a little, there is no money in the kitty. How is this to be understood?"

"Nikolay Timofeyevich is quite right," V. Beznos, deputy general director of the combine in charge of economic questions, told me. "The collective has fulfilled the targets in terms of all technical and economic indicators. We are making our payments to the budget and to suppliers on time. We always have free money in our current account. In the 1st quarter we made a profit of R22 million more than in the same period last year. But on the days when (according to the collective contract) wages are to be paid, the Ilichevskiy branch of the Industrial Construction Bank refuses to issue cash. There have been delays of 3 and 5 days..."

The Ilich combine is not alone in finding itself in this situation. At various times miners at Yenakiyev and Torez, machine builders at Yasinovataya, chemical industry workers at Makeyevka, and rural working people in the oblast have not received money for wages. **In the 1st 4 months of the year alone more than 4,900 cases of delays in paying wages occurred. The delays range from 2 days to 2 weeks. Late payments have affected the interests of hundreds of thousands of working people in 1,090 oblast enterprises and organizations.** If we compare this with January-April last year we find there were only 79 such cases.

But perhaps many collectives have simply not earned the money under the conditions of economic accountability? Yes, there are such cases, but they are few. Enterprise workers themselves were to blame in only 306 out of the almost 5,000 violations. Some collectives have found themselves in an unenviable financial position and therefore have no money in the current account. In other enterprises either the wages were not credited on time, or

the cashier did not go to the bank on the stipulated day. This is no good, of course. But, as you can see, the delays mainly stem from the lack of cash at bank branches.

"Why?" I asked V. Yatsenko, deputy chief of the bank's oblast administration.

"The receipts from trading organizations, transport and consumer service enterprises, and resources obtained from public events, apartment rents, and other sources are not enough to pay the wages," he said. "We therefore have to resort to issuing money, that is, putting into circulation extra paper money that is not backed up by goods."

It is important to stress that the problem of money circulation is markedly eased in Donetsk Oblast by the fact that almost 1 ruble in 3 is paid through savings banks and that the system of cashless transactions to pay for apartment rents and municipal services is highly developed. Without that it would simply be a catastrophe.

But why has such a serious situation come about? Primarily because the oblast is chronically failing to fulfill its cash **plan**. This **depends directly upon commodity turnover in trade.** The proportion of the cash plan represented by commodity turnover is very great, and this is graphic evidence of a serious lag in the sphere of paid services. But the commodity turnover plan is coming apart at the seams: There are not enough goods.

"The shelves rapidly empty," V. Kramnoy, chief of the oblast trade administration, complained. "The shortfall in commodity resources allocated in relation to the plans is over R0.5 billion. Stocks of fabric, clothes, footwear, fur products, meat products, fish, and many other items are lower than last year... We have almost no unmarketable goods now. The warehouses and depots are empty: The requisite stock of goods is R100 million below the normative."

The oblast has drawn up and is implementing measures to bring extra resources into circulation. These include the use of economical methods of storing vegetables, the purchase of goods in short supply from outside the oblast, the setting up of departments and sections in major stores to sell items produced by cooperatives, the sale of substandard goods and production waste products, and so forth.

It is thereby planned to obtain R150 million of the R516-million shortfall in the commodity turnover plan. As can be seen, the gap remains large. In the 1st 2 years consumer goods production under the oblast's comprehensive program fell R244 million short. Zhdanov machine builders, for example, failed to supply 20,000 "Malyutka" washing machines, which enjoy enormous demand... And there are quite a few such examples.

Thus a resident of Donetsk Oblast has to spend his money **elsewhere**—mostly in Moscow, Kiev, and the Baltic region.

Here we run up against yet another serious problem. Yes, the Donbass region is now reaping the harvest of past errors. For decades the Donetsk region has been developed **as a purely industrial area.** Enormous capacities have been created and built up in coal, metallurgy, chemical, the thermal power industry, and heavy machine building enterprises. And this is indeed necessary to the country. But at the same time the light and food industries and the output of goods needed by the population have been cast in a secondary role.

Today, when the task is for every oblast to be self-sufficient in consumer goods, it is very difficult to make up the leeway. Yes, it is essential to develop the production of consumer goods in the oblast, and there are quite a few untapped reserves and shortcomings there, but it is also true that it takes time to fill stores with goods. This is not, unfortunately, always understood in the ministries and departments. If they had understood, the oblast would not be in such a dire financial position. Why not, say, temporarily increase the supply of cars, sophisticated consumer goods, and radio equipment for sale in the Donbass... One has the paradox of miners and metallurgy workers receiving high wages but having nothing to buy.

Worker N. Dubovik correctly stressed during his call to the correspondent's office that: "The massive delays in paying wages **discredit restructuring** and the ideas of economic accountability and self-financing. The Donbass needs help."

Yes, the Donbass needs help today. Help not so much in the above-plan issuing of money as in the **supply of goods.** Of course, the enterprises of the Donbass and the oblast organizations themselves must also make energetic and effective efforts to rectify the prevailing situation.

The trade unions must adopt a principled stance. No one in the oblast today can guarantee that wage delays will not recur. Trade unions' protective function here is not just to demand that ministries, departments, and administrative enterprises tackle questions of paying wages more promptly and efficiently. They must facilitate in every way the accelerated development of consumer goods production and the improvement of consumer services and exercise stricter monitoring of the fulfillment of the commodity turnover plan by trade. The activation of workers' control groups monitoring the activity of establishments and organizations serving the population assumes great importance here.

It is the common task of oblast organizations and central departments and ministries to take measures to ensure there is no recurrence of the extreme situations whereby there is nothing with which to pay people who have honestly earned their money.

Excessive Raw Materials Extraction Cited

PM2005160188 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 May 88 p 2

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Arbatov and Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Smirnov carried as part of feature commenting on 5 January article by V. Selyunin: "Seven Tonnes Per Capita"]

[Text] Moscow—Either increase production volumes or restructure the economy, is V. Selyunin's tough definition of one of the most important problems of our development. He is right to be tough. Right because the processes currently taking place in the national economy can be described only as rationalization—certainly not as restructuring, the need for which is really obvious.

The clearest example, in our view, is the extractive complex. The situation in this sector is far from favorable. Economic indicators are falling sharply. While overall growth in industrial capital investments in the 11th 5-Year Plan was less than 20 percent, [the growth rate of] investments in the fuel industry soared to 53 percent and they amounted to R80 billion at 1984 prices. Almost two-thirds were swallowed up by the petroleum industry, which is more than in the two preceding 5-year plans. But what is the return?

In 1984-1985 for the first time in the country's history there was an absolute drop in petroleum extraction, coal extraction did not grow for a number of years and sometimes even fell, and only the dynamic development of the gas industry ensured a small overall growth. All other indicators deteriorated: return on capital, current expenditure, labor productivity, profit, and profitability.

The most alarming feature is that there are no objective preconditions for breaking these negative trends. In fact they seem to be intensifying. Meanwhile new projects for opening up deposits are being drawn up and approved which are doubtful on all counts and sometimes obviously inefficient.

In the gas industry, for example, programs for the faster opening up of the Astrakhan and Yamal gas deposits are already being implemented. The desire to reach an extraction level of 1 trillion cubic meters of gas per year while retaining the present structure of the utilization of all fuel resources is prompting serious misgivings among specialists. The important point is this: The high level of secrecy [zakrytost] surrounding the main figures of the Energy Program makes it possible for sectors in this complex to freely implement projects like these.

The earth is disfigured and scarred with open pits. Who will leave the biggest scar? Who will wound it deepest? The Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy has reached a depth of 350 meters, the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy is still 20 meters short of this mark... Just think: Some 2 billion tonnes of rock, or almost 7 tonnes per capita of the population, are shifted every year in ferrous metallurgy pits alone! But this transportation within the open pits represents only a fraction of transportation work in the extractive complex. But even this is not enough. Long-term plans foresee spending 2-4 times more per unit of extracted raw material. Is there any need to continue counting up the losses? Hardly. The conclusions are obvious. The foundations of the economy are coming apart at the seams. There is a flow of resources from its upper, consumer levels to the lower, strictly production level. It is the apotheosis of the senseless cost-based epic. An essentially antisocial era.

Do those remarks seem harsh? Then we will take one typical example: The opening up of gas resources on the Yamal peninsula. If the abstract rubles needed for this operation were translated into real goods and benefits, for the same money you could choose between the following: increase the country's housing stock by 200 million square meters, give 20 million families their own private car, increase the highway network by 200,000 kilometers (this would meet all of the non-Chernozem Zone's requirements!), fundamentally retool the light and food industries, and so on and so forth. Finally, you could realize an energy-saving program, which in terms of efficiency is far superior to the growth in gas production achieved by opening up the Yamal peninsula.

So why are we so keen to exploit the earth's resources? There are stereotyped ways of thinking in this area. It is believed that a high level of raw material extraction helps to strengthen our defense capability and economic independence. A dubious assertion! After all, while we are particularly fussy about importing raw materials, we have no hesitation in importing food and progressive (as we see it) technology. Where does the greater dependence lie? If it is in the import of raw materials, then we should say: Poor Japan!...

It is time to understand that nations now become renowned not for how much ore and other resources they extract but for the way in which they use these resources. Stricken by narrow specialization, our extractive sectors have come to resemble abscesses on the face of the national economy—fully consonant with the precise aphorism of Kozma Prutkov. Wastefulness has its roots in this one-sidedness. Hundreds of thousands of tonnes of resources remain on the tailings of one department or enterprise while others go to incredible efforts to obtain the same resources, going where no man has gone before and traveling the length and breadth of the country.

Writing about this is really bad form, like telling an old joke. But the departments which have accumulated enormous production capital still endeavor to get more and more out of the treasury... The entire fatherland has turned into a gigantic Klondike, where everyone is in a hurry to hammer in his tent peg and stake out his plot. The bigger, the better.

So we have seen that what is a burden on the treasury is extremely advantageous to the departments. Today, from the standpoint of efficiency, small, local deposits are becoming increasingly important. Their advantages include proximity to the consumer and manpower and the possibility of establishing small and consequently flexible comprehensive production units. However, a department is the last thing an army of these "mini units" would need. The very fact that they are comprehensive units would come into conflict with the products list for sectors, the need to fulfill a ministerial plan in terms of volume indicators, and the need to comply with a program determining the siting of productive forces. Is this not the reason why small deposits are ignored in plans for the long-term development of the raw material base?

The restructuring of the extractive complex is a very important task. It primarily envisages a change of goals. At present, however, it is only possible to speak of a simulacrum of restructuring: Enterprises are preparing to make the transition to economic accountability, which, given the old goals, will require a substantial increase in the price of raw materials. In other words, society will have to pay to maintain an inefficient, extensive structure of raw material supply. In circumstances like these we should not expect to see an improvement in living standards.

We are certainly not opposed to the idea of revising prices—they do indeed need to be changed. What we are against is the tailoring of prices to suit the current state of affairs and the retention of the wasteful raw material gross output approach. Man cannot live by ore alone. Restructuring in this area must begin by determining the quantity of raw materials it would be expedient to extract in our country.

But we have to rid ourselves of departmentalism if we are to ensure this approach. People will object at this point. It is felt that the main task of any ministry is to formulate a unified technical policy. We must admit, we do not understand why technical policy should be unified at a time of great technological diversity and constant change. In the extractive sectors this seems totally absurd, as each deposit is absolutely unique. A unified and consequently inflexible policy has been, is, and will continue to breed stagnation. We do not need a unified policy but a long-term one. A policy incorporating an analysis of various technologies and consultation services—services, not leadership.

However, if monopolies are preserved even this will have little effect. If there really is no possibility at present of completely abandoning the ministries, we must at least take steps to ensure that they are dependent on the enterprises rather than the other way around.

Curbing the extractive sectors' endeavor to expand is the first task of restructuring in this sphere. One possible solution lies in regularly revising prices as expenditure changes and, in line with the new prices, changing the proportion of newly extracted raw materials in the supply structure of industry as a whole. Perhaps it would be worth establishing a procedure whereby new extractive plants are created solely on the basis of consumers' funds. In other words, in those cases where the consumer has exhausted all cheaper sources: possible economies, the use of secondary resources, and so forth. Finally, we must put an end to the practice whereby sectors' work is evaluated on the basis of quantitative indicators.

Regional associations, which would be tasked with making rational use of regions' resources, have great prospects. It would be worth integrating many extractive enterprises with the consumer in a single complex—where this is possible on a territorial basis. Of course, this must be done voluntarily, taking account of the interests of everyone involved and the national economy as a whole.

In our opinion, the significance of V. Selyunin's article transcends the bounds of the problem it raises. Apart from anything else, it is opposed to stereotyped thinking. The need for a change in the attitude of both society and statesmen to the concept of economic growth is long overdue. In our view, a false opinion has taken shape: If growth rates are high, the economy must be functioning normally. This attitude has long been criticized—and criticized more than once—but it is still widespread and influential. It is high time to devote paramount attention to structural indicators and qualitative growth.

But there is one condition, without which this transition cannot be made. It is a matter of establishing economic glasnost. Moreover, it should not be the initiative of some of the boldest and most competent journalists. Every member of our society must have the legal right of access to economic information. Only in this situation will the discussion of major problems be a discussion among equals rather than merely enlightenment activity—which is also useful, of course, but clearly inadequate. An atmosphere of economic glasnost will, apart from anything else, deprive departments of the opportunity to refer to secret or semisecret documents and deal with very important matters at their own discretion, only giving the people the right to approve and implement what has already been decided. Or to participate in unofficial protest movements, which are usually weak due to a dearth of information.

We have tried to demonstrate how bad it is for the economy when more fuel and raw materials are extracted than necessary. But many may object, using figures to show what major losses we incur as a result of fuel and raw material shortages. The figures will be impressive. But if you compare the quantity of raw material shortfalls with the above-norm raw material stocks and losses and with the extent to which raw material consumption exceeds the proper level, the so-called shortage can in no way be related to low production levels.

In short, we are against the idea of the extractive complex being swept along by the acceleration "campaign." We must produce no more and no less raw material than we need.

Agricultural

'Rural Hour' Debates Cooperatives Law

LD2305140088 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service at 0900 GMT on 22 May carries its "Rural Hour" program, which is devoted to coverage of the debates of the Draft Law on Cooperatives carried in the past week in the Supreme Soviet's Legislative Proposals Commission and Agro-Industrial Commission. The program consists of recorded excerpts of some speeches at these commissions interspersed with comments by Academician V.A. Tikhonov of the Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V.I.Lenin.

The program begins with recorded remarks by Professor T.I. Karyagina, Doctor of Economics, who says: I ask you, Supreme Soviet deputies, to delay the decree on taxation. I am not saying that it should be abolished. We ought to have progressive taxation, but the decree must be delayed. The point is that in the form in which it has been elaborated by the USSR Ministry of Finance, it is not a well-thought out scientific document." He continues: "The reason it is so important to do this is that we economists who study the actual consumer market in our country know just how disastrous the situation is in the Soviet Economy regarding the provision of goods and services. We have done some calculations on the overall size of the gray, nonlabor income generated in the national economy as a whole." "In the services sector, the gray market amounts to about R14 billion to R16 billion annually. For comparison, the official statistics give R45 billion, which means that the underground sector accounts for 1/3 of all services. If this decree goes through and comes into force it will again provide impetus for the further development of the gray economy. I do not think there is any need to explain to you just how colossal a social evil this is".

Tikhonov then comments: "As you can see, although it has achieved very great success in comparison with, let's say, 1927-28, our agricultural sector is less efficient than in most Western countries where there has been no collectivization. This is because by allowing the peasants to be alienated from the land, we introduced a system which alienated him from production results. We alienated these results not only from the peasant, but from the collective farm as well by forcibly appropriating the grain. It was not by chance that the so-called first commandment was promulgated: Harvested grain must be delivered first and foremost to the state, and only what remains is yours. But when times were hard, this remainder was also shovelled away by the state. The problem with our procurement system is that it has retained its function of forcibly appropriating grain. In the name of general slogans including social ones as well as economic abstract slogans, we spurned, we renounced economic expediency in the name of social and abstract economic slogans concerning production efficiency."

Recorded remarks by S.S. Gulsiren, member of Legislative Proposals Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, are then played: "It's all very well for you to set up all these cooperatives here in Moscow and other large cities with all the right conditions, but I invite you to come to the remote villages and try setting them up there. You know, comrades, the peasants and collective farm workers are not becoming attached to the soil; they are trying to leave precisely for these cooperatives and the large cities. There are no longer any families to create family contracts with: There is a mother and father, but the children are leaving because the cities offer the right conditions."

"Sometimes because of the lack of roads, we have to bake our own bread. The peasants and collective farm workers who live in the depths of the country should not only be given more pay, but medals as well for living in such conditions." "We are giving too little thought, not enough thought—both at the top and we leaders, ourselves—to improving the peasants' life. We are asking them to provide us with meat, milk, eggs, and wool, but what are we giving them? Gulsiren adds: "It's not whole families who are leaving, it's just the young people. I ought to say that they are leaving for the cooperatives where they can work as engineers and get an education. It's the people with abilities who are leaving. Forgive me for being so blunt, but it's the idiots who stay behind." "We are being told to open cooperatives in the villages, but for a cooperative you need someone with a head on his shoulders, and you just cannot find such people, you cannot find them. Only those who are incapable are staying behind," he concludes.

In recorded remarks, G.Ye. Bystrov, Doctor of Juridical Science, says: "The creation of the state agro-industrial committee has increased the centralization and bureaucratization of the administration system, and the Law on Cooperatives does not protect the collective farm from interference, administration by command, and the bureaucratic instructions which come streaming down. In Yaroslavl Oblast alone there are 10 administrators for each farm, and this does not include the party or local soviet apparatus. I am talking only about state agro-industrial bodies. Given such a huge number of administrators, there is a merry-go-round of paperwork. Together with staff at the Institute of Law, we calculated that over the 9 years from 1965 to 1975 the former Ministry of Agriculture issued 6,000 orders and we were complaining that that was a lot. But in 1986 the new agro-industrial bodies for Russia issued 1,086 orders, and for the first 8 months of 1987 there 757 orders. This, of course, causes an increase in paperwork at the local level."

Bystrov adds: "The system of party and state management of our economy has produced managers who are very pliant and spineless, and who are completely

deprived of independence. Those farm chairmen who have some skill, who are enterprising, and who can think independently about what is best very often come into conflict with the law, because there are so many departmental instructions that by observing one of them the enterprising manager inevitably must contradict some law. Therefore, we have the totally unpleasant situation in which good, enterprising chairmen and good, valuable specialists are hounded, while our legal system very often does nothing to protect them, because it too suffers from a great many defects, as well as being under outside pressures."

Later, V.F. Popov, member of Preparatory Commission of the Chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, makes these recorded remarks: "So what we now have is state orders—that is, the plan under another name, to somehow deceive us, to speak frankly. The agro-industrial committee breaks everything down according to oblast, the oblast according to rayon, and so on down to individual farms. It is the same command-administration approach as before. It is a pretext for preserving the command-administration leadership." "They are doing everything possible to retain the right to poke their noses into things," Popov says adding, "we can sense that it is primarily a case of self-preservation. They are not afraid that we might not do something properly, but afraid for themselves."

Scientific

Three 'Cosmos' Satellites Launched 21 May

LD2405063588 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—The Soviet Union launched three satellites of the Cosmos series on May 21, 1988 by one booster rocket, the Proton.

The satellites, Cosmos-1946, 1947 and 1948, have been designed for testing elements and equipment of the space navigation system that is being developed with a view to locating the whereabouts of civilian aircraft and ships of the merchant and fishing fleet of the USSR.

The satellites have been placed in a near-circular orbit with the following parameters:

—Initial period of revolution—11 hours 15 minutes,

—Distance from the earth's surface—19,137 kilometres,

—Inclination of the orbit—64.2 degress.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally. Mission Control Centre is processing incoming information.

Activities of 'Mir' Cosmonauts Reported

LD2405111788 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT 24 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—A TASS correspondent reports from the Ground Control Centre:

Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov continue their flight on board the orbital complex Mir ("peace").

In the past several days, the crew was primarily concerned with unloading the Progress-36 spaceship: A great part of the new equipment, research instruments and food has been transferred from it to the basic module.

As planned, the crew will today check apparatus for conducting astrophysical, geophysical and medical research and experiments under the programme of the joint Soviet-Bulgarian space mission and do some regular maintenance work on board the station.

As usual, the day's routine includes a physical workout, one of the best ways to keep efficient in space and stave off the deleterious effect of weightlessness on the human organism.

Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov feel well.

The mission is proceeding according to plan.

Research Work Continues

LD2005143988 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—A TASS correspondent reports from the Mission Control Centre:

The Soviet Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are completing their fifth month in orbital flight.

Over the past two days the crew of the manned complex "Mir" were unloading the spaceship "Progress-36", placing in position the equipment delivered. In accordance with the plan of routine maintenance work the cosmonauts have replaced separate elements of onboard systems, whose service life is over.

They have carried out several series of experiments with the use of scientific equipment of the astrophysical module Kvant. On May 18 they were observing a new X-ray star in Vulpecula Galaxy, and on May 19—the X-ray source Cygnus X-3. On the same days they were carrying out photography of separate regions of the Ursa Major constellation in the ultra-violet part of the spectrum.

Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are carrying out today a medical checkup, which includes an examination of the cardiovascular system, a check on eyesight, measurement of body weight and assessment of the state of muscles.

A new cycle of astrophysical research has also been planned. The telescopes of the orbital observatory "Roentgen" will be trained on the Roentgen pulsar "Hercules" X-1 and the Corona Borealis constellation has been chosen as a target of photography for the ultraviolet telescope "Glazar".

The cosmonauts will take a rest tomorrow. Both of them are in good health and feel well.

Soviet, Bulgarian Cosmonauts Hold Briefing

LD2005143488 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—Over 40 experiments are to be carried out in orbit by the Soviet-Bulgarian space crew in the course of a ten-day flight planned to begin on June 7. This was reported at a press conference at the Zvezdnyy township today.

The main crew are Commander Anatoliy Solovyev, flight engineer Viktor Savinykh and Bulgarian research cosmonaut Aleksandur Aleksandrov. Vladimir Lyakhov, Aleksandr Serebrov and Krasimir Stoyanov are the stand-ins.

Vladimir Lyakhov will also be commander of the main Soviet-Afghan crew, its flight scheduled for August.

The failure of a propulsion unit is known to have prevented full implementation of the program of the first Soviet-Bulgarian space flight in 1979. The flight now will be held at a qualitatively new level. As was noted at a press conference by Aleksandur Aleksandrov, the results of experiments were analyzed on earth nine years ago. Up-to-date equipment enables analyses of experiments aboard and correction of the course of work.

The flight program provides for explorations in astrophysics, remote sounding of the surface of the earth, space biology and medicine with the use of scientific instruments, designed by Soviet and Bulgarian specialists among them Aleksandur Aleksandrov, who defended a dissertation at the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Nuclear Icebreaker 'Arktika' Leaves Murmansk

PM2005135888 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Hurrying East"]

[Text] Murmansk, 17 May—After its long watch in the ice, the nuclear icebreaker "Arktika" spent only a few days in its home port. After replenishing its food stocks and changing crews, the nuclear knight set off again for the high latitudes today.

The icebreaker's path lies eastward. After traversing the whole of the northern sea passage from west to east, on 1 June the "Arktika" is to pick up for escort in the Bering Strait the first Far East transport carrying freight for the inhabitants of the Arctic Ocean coast.

"The crew will have to work here, in the worst of the Arctic ice, until late fall," V. Golokhvastov, captain of the icebreaker, said. "There will be many difficulties, but they do not frighten the seamen. Many have already passed a terrible test here a few years ago, when they freed a large group of transport ships from icy captivity."

The crews of the Murmansk shipping line transport ships are also preparing intensively for the summer Arctic navigation season. Many of them, escorted by nuclear icebreakers, are also to follow the entire Northern Sea route this year, to make their contribution to resolving the task set by the 27th CPSU Congress of the accelerated development and opening up of the natural wealth of the Arctic Ocean coast.

Briefs

Arctic Maps Compliled

The hydrometeorologists of the Pevek and Kolyma directorates have finished compiling maps of the ice situation in the eastern region of the Arctic. From aboard an airplane, they used precision instruments to plot the distribution and size of the ice and its age in the Chukotskoye and East Siberian Seas, in the Proliv Longa, and in the eastern sector of the More Laptevykh. The ice off the coast of eastern Chukotka has been studied with special care. Seaports here will be the first in the high latitudes to raise the flag of 1988 navigation. [Text] [*LD2205002388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 21 May 88*]

Military

Political Directorate Views CPSU Admissions

PM2005150188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 May 88 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "In the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate": "Strengthening Party Ranks"]

[Text] The Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate Bureau has examined the question of the work carried out by political organs and party organizations in 1987 to further organizationally and politically strengthen the party's ranks and qualitatively improve them. The results of the discussion were summed up by Admiral of the Fleet A. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

In the course of the discussion it was noted that Army and Navy political organs and party organizations are on the whole consistently implementing the directives of the

27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Serious Shortcomings in the Work of the Tashkent Oblast Party Organization on Recruitment into the Party and the Strengthening of the Party's Ranks." Army and Navy party organizations have been reinforced with the best servicemen from among officers, ensigns, warrant officers, regulars, and military academy graduates, and also servicemen doing their military service. The absolute majority of those admitted to the party are actively contributing specific actions to the effort of restructuring which is under way and making a tangible contribution to the struggle to meet the 19th all-union party conference in worthy fashion.

The influx of young blood into Army and Navy party organizations has contributed to their further consolidation. The number of primary party organizations and organizations enjoying the rights of primary party organizations has increased. One in two of them is headed by a party committee (bureau). Most subunits have a party organization or a party group. Special attention is being paid to the organizational strengthening of party organizations of units and ships on standby alert duty and to party membership among servicemen of leading specialities. Army and Navy party organizations are approaching the 19th all-union party conference further strengthened in the ideological, political, and organizational respects and fully capable of successfully resolving the tasks facing them.

At the same time, the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate Bureau noted that questions of selection for CPSU membership and the education of the young reinforcements of the party still do not occupy the appropriate place in the work of a number of political organs and party organizations of military okrugs and groups of forces and fleets in the restructuring of party work. Analysis has shown that recruitment into the CPSU is frequently assessed only on the basis of quantitative indicators. The formalistic statistical approach makes it impossible to determine the degree of party organizations' influence on all aspects of the subunits' combat training activity and obscures the true state of affairs. The selection of new members frequently takes place at the local level without a serious investigation of the political, professional, and moral qualities of the recruits and of their personal contribution to restructuring. Open party meetings devoted to recruitment into the party are frequently of a formal nature. The insufficiently responsible attitude of primary party organizations to the reinforcement of their ranks is borne out by cases where political organ party commissions have to reverse organizations' decisions on accepting people as CPSU candidate members.

Shortcomings in recruitment into the CPSU also persist in the work of the political organs and party organizations of a number of military colleges where the pursuit of high party membership among graduates frequently results in serious mistakes and miscalculations being made.

Political organs and party organizations are doing little to enhance the responsibility of those who recommend people for party membership and to raise the role played by the candidate stage. Young Communists are not always set a moral example by their senior comrades and subsequently slacken their work efforts.

The exposed shortcomings show that certain political directorates and political departments of units and military educational establishments are paying only superficial attention to this important sector of party work and proceed without duly taking account of the demands of restructuring, and without involving themselves deeply in the day-to-day activities of primary party organizations.

In the adopted resolution the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate Bureau instructs the political directorates of Armed Forces branches, okrugs, groups of forces, and fleets and the political departments of units and military educational establishments to carry out a comprehensive analysis of the state of work relating to recruitment into the party and the education of Communists and to elaborate and implement specific measures to ensure strict observance of the main directives of the 27th CPSU Congress and the provisions of the CPSU Statutes on questions of the development and maintenance of high combat readiness of the party ranks as one of the decisive factors in the enhancement of the vanguard role of the party and the successful implementation of the policy of restructuring.

It is proposed that these questions be discussed at regular gatherings and seminars of political organ chiefs and secretaries of party commissions, party committees, and bureaus. Political organs and party organizations must introduce more democracy and glasnost into the party membership selection process. They must proceed from the interests of the further intensification of political influence on key sectors of the combat readiness, life, and combat training activity of troops and fleets and the achievement of a qualitatively new situation in units and on ships. The party ranks must be replenished with morally irreproachable people on the basis of an individual approach, people who are distinguished by political maturity and the strength of their ideological convictions. A person's attitude to restructuring and concrete actions in the sector entrusted to him represent the most important criterion for recruitment to the party's ranks. It is necessary to make wider use of the practice of discussing CPSU candidate members' statements about party membership at open party meetings and also at meetings of military and labor collectives as an important condition for the selection for party membership of truly progressive and worthy people.

Political organs, party committees and bureaus, and primary party organizations are instructed to substantially improve the work with party candidate members and to ensure their active participation in party life; to adopt additional measures to step up the ideological and

moral tempering of the new party reinforcements and of all Communists and to educate them in the traditions of Bolshevism. Instilling Communist convictions, an active stance in the implementation of the party line aimed at restructuring, and high moral qualities in members and candidate members of the party must be the subject of day-to-day concern. The activities of young Communist circles and schools must be revitalized, and dialogue and collective discussion of topical questions of the theory and policy of the party at the current stage must be introduced more widely in practice. Every party organization must regularly hear the reports of candidate party members about their progress through the candidate stage and their fulfillment of statutory rights and obligations. Measures must be adopted to improve the study by members and candidate members of the party of the fundamentals of party building and the CPSU Program and Statutes. It is important to ensure that the Communists' vanguard role is expressed in concrete actions and practical efforts aimed at strengthening combat readiness and the standard of organization and discipline and enhancing the cohesion of multinational military collectives.

The attention of political directorates and all political organs is drawn to the CPSU Central Committee instruction that the situation in primary party organizations exerts a decisive influence on shaping Communists into political fighters. It is necessary to persistently strive to ensure that the atmosphere in every Communist collective is characterized by high ideological content, mutual exactingness, support for everything new and progressive that is borne in the course of the preparations for the 19th all-union party conference, and by the equality of all party members before the CPSU Statutes.

The editorial offices of the journal KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL and the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and the press organs of the military okrugs, groups of forces, and fleets are instructed to give more vivid and more broad coverage to party organizations' work aimed at the consolidation of the party ranks and the education of young Communists.